40511

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* GREGORY LEROY TEAL

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE FORMATION OF SOCIAL CLASSES: WITH REFERENCE TO KOREAN IMMIGRANTS IN EDMONTON

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* MASTERS OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* ~~1978~~ 1979

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. David H. BAI

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* September 8 1978 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Gregory Teal

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 6204 109 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE FORMATION OF SOCIAL CLASSES: WITH REFERENCE TO KOREAN IMMIGRANTS IN EDMONTON

BY

GREG TEAL

(C)

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTERS OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

(SPRING, 1979)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled, Urban Anthropology and the Problems of the Formation of Social Classes: With Reference to Korean Immigrants in Edmonton, submitted by Greg Teal in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS in Anthropology.

Supervisor

External Examiner

Date Sept 7, 1978

DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this thesis to Richard Frucht.

ABSTRACT

Urban anthropology has generally assumed the city to be a distinct social form or cultural type. Following traditional anthropological practice, urban case studies have focused on small, bounded social groups. A group's structure is then explained by way of the behaviour patterns or forms of identity of individual group members that arise from their adaptation to the urban way of life.

Positing the city as an abstract entity discourages the development of a historical understanding of the actual role of the city in social life. Describing behaviour patterns and modes of identity do not substitute for social analysis that attempts to explain why people act or how and why social change occurs.

Examining the city as a part of the social division of labour enables the development of an historical analysis of the city. Urban groups are not the hapless creatures of a thing called the city, but products of the division of labour in which both the city and the urban population are embedded.

Korean immigrants to Edmonton were studied, in part for the intrinsic value of gaining knowledge about a little known community, but mostly to test the viability of established assumptions of urban social analysis. It was found that most Koreans were concentrated in a few industries, in part because these industries accepted inexperienced workers. Once employed

however, these people generally discovered that working conditions prohibited learning English on the job or gaining experience that would be helpful in obtaining better jobs. The city itself did not determine the structure of the Korean community. Community structure developed within the conditions of the social division of labour and the immigrants' place on the labour market.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. David Bai and Dr. Michael Asch for their patience and advice. In that regard I also thank Marlene Kadar.

The fieldwork for this thesis was done as part of a summer Temporary Employment Project with the Governement of Alberta in the summer of 1975. Dr. David Bai supervised the project, and Heesoon Bai was a thorough and diligent interviewer whose work was invaluable to the research.

In addition, I gratefully acknowledge the patient typing work of Diana Hart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE FORMATION OF SOCIAL CLASSES.....	1
	Introduction	1
2	REVIEW OF URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY: THE CITY AS A CULTURAL TYPE	9
	Urban Social Theory	9
	Robert Redfield and the Constitution of Urban Anthropology.....	13
	Urban Anthropology: The Present State of the Field.....	22
	Conclusions.....	32
3	THE CITY AND THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR.	37
	Urban Anthropology and the Study of Class.....	37
	The City as a Product of the Social Division of Labour.....	39
	Capitalist Cities, Urbanization, and Immigration.....	50
	Conclusion.....	64
4	KOREAN IMMIGRATION AND THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR.....	67
	Introduction.....	67
	The Korean Immigrant Population as an Urban Ethnic Community.....	69
	Historical Determinants of Korean Immigration.....	75
	Korean Immigration and the Division of Labour in Edmonton.....	93
	Korean Migration: Individual, Social Class and Institutional Framework.....	93
	Sectoral and occupational concentration of Korean Immigrants.....	100

CHAPTER PAGE

5 CONCLUSION: CLASS AND COMMUNITY..... 110

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 123

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to develop an alternative to the existing modes of analysis of urban anthropology, one which analyzes urban social relations within the context of the division of labour in which they occur. Although urban anthropology has contributed to our understanding of urban and urban-rural social relations, its almost exclusive emphasis on the the cultural and behavioural aspects of urban populations has neglected the role of social class in defining relations within and between urban cultural communities. The thesis attempts to demonstrate that social class is more important than the culture concept as employed by urban anthropology in conditioning and structuring social relations within a specific urban milieu: the Korean community in Edmonton, Alberta.

On the basis of a case study of the Korean community, it is argued that the subordination of South Korean labour to international capital is the root cause of South Korean migration and that this subordination continues to define the situation of most Korean immigrants in Edmonton. At the same time, there are class and occupational differences between Korean immigrants that tend to fragment and segment the community along class lines. The results of the study suggest that anthropological studies of urban communities

should be based on a combined analysis of the situation of the specific community within the existing social division of labour and of the tendencies of social cohesion and fragmentation arising from its members' involvement in the production process.

Urban anthropology developed from the general body of cultural anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s. It represented the gradual widening of the scope of the anthropological perspective, beginning with the study of primitive hunters and gatherers, to the examination of peasant societies in the 1940s, and finally, the study of cities. One American anthropologist who has had the opportunity to study primitive peoples, peasants and city dwellers claims that urban anthropology "represents the third and probably final definition of its subject matter" (Foster, 1974).

What is new about urban anthroplogy is the study of culturally heterogeneous societies. For, not only do most cities today contain diverse culture groups, they also exist within a larger cultural context which comprises other cities as well as rural areas. It is to be expected, then, that urban anthropology would focus a lot of energy on issues of definition: what is the culture of the city; what defines urban social groups; what is the relation between the city and the country; how do rural peoples change when they migrate to the city? In seeking answers to these types of questions, anthropologists have developed the study of, among other things, ethnicity and social networks.

In the study of primitive societies and, to a lesser

extent, peasantries, anthropologists had what they thought were clearly defined communities with well marked social and physical boundaries. The society was "given", as it were, and all we had to do was study it. But anthropologists weren't sure if this was the case with cities, for urban peoples seemed to have different kinds of social relations than primitives and peasants, and urban populations and social groups appeared to be in a constant state of flux. The focal concern of urban anthropology came to be defining the boundaries of social groups and then analyzing the internal structure of the group.

The first boundary and set of cultural characteristics that urban anthropologists came up with had to do with the city itself. Robert Redfield differentiated the city from primitives and peasants by saying that the latter formed the "folk" and the "Little Tradition". The former, of course, constituted the "Great Tradition", the city being the place where people who were in social standing above the folk developed a corresponding metropolitan culture. Urban anthropology by and large adopted the sociological notion of the city as a way of life, and this assumption has guided its practice ever since.

Thus, the operating assumption of urban anthropology, as it became established as a legitimate field of study, was that the city is a unique and distinct cultural form, indeed, an independent variable in the shaping of social life: the city itself influences the social groups within it and the countryside, and rural groups around it.

The next set of boundaries and cultural characteristics

that urban anthropologists developed had to do with the urban population itself. This process of definition was seen as necessary in part because to do fieldwork, anthropologists had to have a definite group to study. Anthropologists focused on groups that were visibly distinct, such as immigrants, ethnic groups and the family. They also developed the concepts of network and field to account for patterns of social relations and activities based on friendship, work, etc.

In defining the boundaries and internal characteristics of urban social groups, urban anthropological analysis became strongly oriented toward the description of behaviour and forms of indentification as things that set one group apart from another. Always in the background of such analysis was the assumption of the city as an independent cultural variable to which urban groups adapt. In fact, these two aspects of urban anthropology are mutually reinforcing: a narrow focus on the description of behaviour and identity does not provide much of a basis for explaining urban social structure, except to assume that it derives from the city, and, on the other side of the coin, assuming the city as a cultural given leads to the study of urban social relations as being derivative of the city itself.

The assumption of the apparent autonomy of the city and the focus on urban social relations as being culturally or behaviourally derived from the city bypasses any analysis of social relations or the city itself within a social division of labour or as being mediated by the actual material ways in which people live and produce, and the social relations arising

therefrom. In order to demonstrate the efficacy of a class analysis of urban social relations and to develop the theory and methodology of such an analysis, the thesis comprises a review of urban anthropology, a theoretical discussion of the relationship between the city as a social form and the division of labour, and the case study of Korean migration and subsequent community formation.

Chapter Two discusses the historical development of modern urban social analysis and presents a critical appraisal of urban anthropology. The discussion focuses specifically on the ways in which urban anthropology adapted and formulated the culture concept to account for urban phenomena and eschewed issues of social class and the division of labour.

Chapter Three, "The City and the Social Division of Labour", presents an alternative theoretical model for the study of the urban domain by situating the city and urban social relations within the context of the social division of labour. The bulk of Chapter Three is an analysis of the city in the capitalist mode of production as a site for industrial production and the accumulation of capital and for the reproduction of the labour force. Urbanization is portrayed as one of the ways by which the urban labour force is reproduced under conditions conducive to the accumulation of capital.

Chapters Four and Five further develop the class analysis of urban social relations by presenting and discussing the results of a case study of Korean immigrants in Edmonton. Chapter Four introduces a brief ethnographic survey

of the Korean community and then analyzes the uneven development of South Korea which has given rise to Korean migration. There follows a discussion of the migration process itself. Finally, the location of Korean immigrants in the production process is examined in detail. The patterns of occupational and sectoral concentration of Korean immigrants are seen as instrumental in the formation of the Korean community.

The fifth and concluding chapter continues the analysis of the Korean community begun in Chapter Four. Here, however, the differential location of Koreans in the production process and class and occupational differences between them are seen to account for the peculiar fragmentation of the community. It is concluded that urban anthropology's cultural emphasis and such conceptualizations as ethnicity and social networks cannot be regarded as the primary agencies which define and condition the formation of the Korean community or its internal relations and situation within the larger urban context. Korean immigration is rooted in the division of labour and the formation of the Korean community is conditioned by this concentration in a few economic sectors. Class and occupational differences arising from their differential position within the division of labour account both for the fragmentation of the community and the patterns of social interaction between and within various segments of the community.

The fieldwork for this thesis was conducted between

May and August of 1975 under the auspices of the Summer Temporary Employment Program (S.T.E.P.) of the Government of Alberta. The case study of the Korean community was part of a larger project intended to study a number of East Asian communities in Edmonton. As the project developed however, practical and theoretical considerations led the author to focus primarily on the Korean community. Supervising and participating in a number of community studies spread the author's resources to thin. In the Korean case study the author had the invaluable cooperation of Ms. Heesoon Bai, who acted as interpreter and conducted interviews of her own, as well as the supervision of Dr. David Bai, whose assessment of issues concerning the Korean community helped to provide order for a study that was necessarily short and intense.

The major theoretical consideration in selecting the Korean community was the belief that discovering and articulating the extent to which social class is important in the formation of a relatively young (ten years) and small (five-hundred to six-hundred individuals) urban immigrant community could provide clues as to how social class operates on a larger urban scale and validate class analysis in the study of urban anthropology.

Because of the theoretical emphasis of the thesis — that is, the critique of urban anthropology and the formulation of an alternative analytical approach to the study of urban social relations — the case study forms a second level

in order of importance. As such, the case study itself remains incomplete in some of those areas which would normally be given more emphasis in more straightforward ethnographies. In addition, the brief duration of fieldwork and the randomness of interviews prevented a full ethnographic presentation of the community. Nevertheless, the intense period of participant observation and the randomness of interviews served to illuminate to the author the dynamics of community formation. Indeed, some of the mechanical problems involved in conducting interviews, such as the informants' general incapacity with the English language and the problem of scheduling interviews around the dictates of shiftwork, underscored some of the problems facing both the individual informants and the community as a whole. As a result the author was able, relatively quickly, to focus attention on employment patterns which lay at the root of many of the problems facing Korean immigrants and their community.

During the course of fieldwork, the order of importance of social class as against the other variables, in terms of its effects on uniting and dividing Korean immigrants, was established. Thus, the case study provided sufficient material to demonstrate the thematic concerns of the thesis, and it is this material that has been selected for the theoretical discussion of the relationship between urban communities and the division of labour.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF URBAN ANTHROPOLOGY: THE CITY AS A CULTURAL TYPE

1. Urban Social Theory

The study of the city, or various aspects thereof, has a long history in social science. Even before Weber's The City, published in 1904, Tönnies', Community and Society, 1887, and Simmel's, Metropolis and Mental Life, 1902-3, addressed themselves to specifically urban problems. Earlier still, Fustel de Coulanges' The Ancient City, originally published in 1864, evoked a great deal of interest in urban studies. These founders and forerunners of social science considered the city within their intellectual frame of reference precisely because of the phenomenal growth of cities in the initial and later stages of industrial capitalism, with its concommitant accumulation of wealth and creation of poverty on a mass scale. They asked: what were the origins of modern cities, what are the effect of cities on urban populations, how are cities socially integrated?

There have, of course, been significant divergences between and within particular social sciences as regards the study of the city. Most scholars and schools of thought do, nevertheless, trace their modes of analysis directly or indirectly back to the aforementioned writers, while attempting to build upon the foundations laid by them. In reconstructing

the study and theory of the city probably the greatest challenge is to isolate fundamental premises of particular schools of thought, and trace both their precedents and subsequent history. If we take for example the Chicago School, which dominated urban studies for several decades and is as yet not entirely dismantled, we must be able to trace the intellectual antecedents of the ecological model of the city, understand why it acquired paradigmatic status when it did, and determine its various continuing influences.

Such a task is necessary, not in terms of an intellectual history of urban studies, but in terms of developing a critical urban social theory. There is an emergent Marxism which is attempting to do this -- analyze the city in terms of the laws of motion and the social relations of capitalist society (Harvey, 1973; Castelle, 1977; Mellor, 1977). A leading figure of this trend has not hesitated to label the urban sociology thus far prevailing as "ideological":

> ...urban sociology is not a scientific domain, nor a field for observation, but rather an ideological artifact. That is, its existence, as it was constituted historically, is justified less by the effects of the knowledge it produces than by its ideological impact on social relations (Castells, 1975:7).

Ideology is the distortion or mystification of social relations; ideological thinking generally confuses things as they appear to be for things as they really are. Urban sociology is ideological in the sense that it mystifies the object of its analysis — the city—and thereby reduces the possibility of understanding urban phenomena as they really are. This does not mean to suggest, however, that Simmel, Tönnies and Weber

believed that they were mystifying capitalist social relations, regardless of their various attempts to refute Marx's analysis of capitalism. Each of them abhored the capitalist city and its effects on social life. Tönnies, for one, wrote:

> ...the towns by their influence and importance achieve in the nation predominance over the rural organization. In consequence, country and village must use more of their own productive forces for the support and furtherance of the urban areas than they can spare for the purposes of reproduction. Therefore the rural organization is doomed to dissolution...urban life seems to exert by itself, producing and consuming, tending to dominate the whole country more and more, to draw from it its forces, and to lead to their destruction (1963: 234).

The ideological character of the early urban social theory does not derive from an attempt to gloss over the problems of modern industrial cities, but rather is embedded in the theorists' critiques of the modern city. The mystification of social relations manifested itself primarily in three ways: 1) the romanticization of the pre-industrial city -- the European feudal towns; 2) the breakdown of urban social life seen as being rooted in the modern industrial city itself, rather than in the social relations which gave both form and content to the city, and; 3) the city itself became the object of analysis. The overall effect of these three premises of urban social theory was that social relations themselves weren't examined except as products or expressions of the urban form -- the city itself became the independent variable in social analysis.

With some adjustments, this early body of urban social theory constituted a major influence on the Chicago school's brand of urban sociology. One other influence was Durkeim's

concept of social order and social integration. The inclusion of Durkheim was important because an exclusive focus on urban social breakdown would be at odds with the fact that urban society continued to "function". Now, just as there is nothing inherently wrong with social science posing questions about social breakdown, there is nothing inherently wrong with posing questions about social integration. However, the Chicago school, following Weber, Simmel and Tönnies in misplacing the source of urban social relations on the city itself, could not give significant emphasis to the role of social relations in social integration or disintegration. Rather, following Durkheim, Park, one of the major exponents of the Chicago school, stressed the "moral order" as the binding force in urban industrialized society. A cruder representation, but nevertheless derived from the ideological premises of the early urban social theorists, and very much a part of the Chicago school, was Burgess' and McKenzie's notion of the urban concentric ring, which attempts to explain, or rather describe social order and social change by way of environment and technology (Park, Burgess, McKenzie, 1925).

Wirth's well known and influential article, "Urbanism as a Way of Life" can perhaps be accorded the status of being the condensed expression of fifty years of urban social theory (Wirth, 1938). The notion of urbanism employed by Wirth and the Chicago school denotes a radical dualism between town and country -- they are two different cultural and ecological forms. The city, as a unique cultural type, operates under autonomous

laws of social development--increasing population size and heterogeneity, community succession and displacement--in other words, laws derived basically from ecological studies of animal populations. Finally, as social relations themselves are accorded a distinctly secondary status they are not made the focus of research and analysis, except in a highly reified form; as the city is the independent and determining variable, the focus of study is the effect of urban form on individual behaviour, and behavioural adaptation to urban form.

2. Robert Redfield and the Constitution of Urban Anthropology

The cultural bent of much of the literature of urban sociology, as well as the escalating rate of urbanization in many of the areas that anthropologists had traditionally studied, encouraged anthropologists from the late 1940s on to take up the question of the city. Urban anthropological investigation began, in part, as an attempt to correct the type of anthropological anti-urban bias characterised by Sapir's well known article, "Culture, Genuine and Spurious". It also struggled against an inherent Eurocentrism in the Chicago school's formulation of urbanism (Weaver and White, 1972: 110). At the same time, an urban focus was seen as a way to "modernize" anthropology. In his presidential address to the American Anthropological Association in 1950, Ralph Beals encouraged anthropologists to conduct urban research on the grounds that urbanism and urbanization are segments of the total field of

culture change, and such studies would enable anthropology to renew exchange and cooperation with sociology. He also claimed that anthropology could test and correct sociological assumptions of general urban characteristics based on Euro-American cities (Beals, 1951).

Despite the attempt represented by urban anthropology to broaden the domain of anthropology and put anthropological theory and methodology to use in correcting ethnocentrism and Eurocentrism in social science, urban anthropology, as we shall attempt to prove, did not significantly reformulate urban social analysis. This failure was--and remains-- the result, not of the wholesale rejection of urban social theory but, rather, the acceptance, often unconsciously, often despite denials to the contrary, of most of the major premises of urban social theory and cultural anthropology. The secret of the continuing distortions of urban social analysis lies, as we shall see, in the application of the culture concept.

In addition to early occasional anthropological commentaries on urban studies, a few serious case studies were conducted by anthropologists prior to the actual formation of urban anthropology as a discipline of study. Most notable were W. Lloyd Warner's "Yankee City" series, in which he discussed social classes, industry and culture in an American town (Warner and Lunt, 1941; Warner, 1941; Warner and Strole, 1945; Warner and Low, 1947). Oscar Lewis's article, "Urbanization Without Breakdown" was also significant in that it was a refutation of the concept of urban social disorganization charac-

teristic of many of the writings of the Chicago school and of the anti-urban bias of anthropology (Lewis, 1952). Nevertheless, these occasional anthropological probings into the urban scene did not induce a general trend toward urban studies. In fact these urban case studies had much more impact on sociology than anthropology. The pioneering work of Warner for example, led the way to the community study approach in sociology, which utilized anthropological methods but focused on modern American towns.

It was Robert Redfield who swung significant anthropological attention toward urban studies. He performed this pivotal role not because his writings on urban issues were necessarily valid or original, for his writings were often subjected to severe criticism from all quarters. But the fact that his writings received so much critical attention is itself an indication of their import. Redfield's wide reception was due to his ability to: 1) relate the urban issue to traditional anthropological concerns, and: 2) provide a theoretical and methodological framework for the anthropological study of urban issues. There were, in addition, two primary sources, which combined, spurred Redfield's focus on urban issues and marked both the significance and limitations of his contribution. The first was his sociological training, in particular with Park and Wirth. The second was his own pioneering work in peasant studies.

Redfield's early writings, particularly Tepoztlan, A Mexican Village, 1930, and to some extent, The Folk Culture of

the Yuctan, 1941, regarded the Mexican villages he studied as isolated folk communities. In his 1947 article, "The Folk Society", Redfield's sociological and anthropological conditioning combined in such a way as to lead him to characterize the folk society as an ideal type, implicity culturally distinct from complex society. As Hauser argued, such a characterization of "folk society" had its precedents in the works of Maine, Tonnies, Durkeim and Sumner (Hauser, 1965). Such a presentation also continued and extended the anthropological tradition of treating the primitive community as an isolated, self-contained social unit. Redfield's notion of the folk-urban dichotomy was widely criticized by Lewis, Tax, Hauser and others (Weaver and White, 1972: 110). It was generally agreed that as presented the concept was rather ethnocentric and not true to life. Redfield was thus forced to refine his positions, which he did via a re-examination of anthropological traditions and the city as a focus of study.

Redfield refined and extended his urban analysis in "The Cultural Role of Cities", written with Milton Singer in 1954. The concern here was still to differentiate the city from folk society, but the city was seen as the extension and transformation of the folk society. The orthogenetic transformation occured where the city formalized the folk culture (the Little Tradition) and established political and administrative control over the folk society. Heterogenetic transformation occured where the folk cultures disappeared under the economic modernization of society, centred in the cities and extending out from them.

Once again, Redfield's revised formulations have been roundly criticized. Hauser, Kolb and others have argued that some of the cities defined by Redfield as being orthogenetic are actually heterogenetic (Hauser, 1965). But, aside from such specific criticisms, Redfield's approach largely conformed to the dominant tendency in urban social analysis--the city was perceived as culturally distinct from folk society, but at the same time it was considered the major source of social change and integration. These crucial points were largely bypassed by critics.

While Redfield's earlier writings and the last-mentioned article have been extensively discussed in anthropology and sociology, it is his last major published work which demands critical attention. In Peasant Society and Culture, 1956, Redfield evaluates traditional anthropological analysis and develops the theoretical and methodological framework for the study of complex society. In "The Cultural Role of Cities", Redfield still characterized folk society as comprising isolated, self-contained and homogeneous communities:

> The folk society may be conceived as that imagined combination of societal elements which would characterize a long-established, homogeneous, isolated and non-literate integral (self-contained) community...(1954: 58).

In Peasant Society and Culture this notion of folk society is used as a point of review of anthropology as a whole. Now Redfield recognizes that this notion actually characterizes anthropology and defines the parameters of its theoretical and methodological forumlations, specifically the concepts of culture, social structure and holism, and the comparative

method. Redfield, however, had spent a considerable part of his career studying communities which in fact were connected with civilizations or national states, and he finally acknowledges the abstractness of the traditional model:

> Of course reality is not like this. Human living is not composed of mutually isolated small primitive groups, and in so far as it was once so composed before the rise of civilization, it had long ceased to be arranged that way when anthropology took hold of the reality at that corner of it where the primitive isolate still existed ...The primitive isolate became connected with the great society while the anthropologist was looking at it; indeed, the anthropologist himself was one of the instruments of this transformation (1956: 9).

The realization that anthropologists were no longer studying primitive societies poses two important questions for Redfield: 1) what is the nature of the new type of society, or, at least, the type of society which forms the new focus of study, and; 2) how, finally, are anthropologists to study this type of society?

This "new" focus of anthropological study is, however, certainly not as young as one might be led to think by the relatively recent anthropological interest in it. In Asia and Latin America--the areas Redfield had referred to in his own work--peasant communities have existed for thousands of years. Such peasant communities exist within the larger framework of what Redfield refers to as civilization, or, the national state. The national state is composed of the local peasant communities on the one hand, and the national urban elites on the other:

> In peasant societies we see a relatively stable and very roughly typical adjustment between local and national and/or feudal life, a developed larger social system in which there are two cultures within one culture, one social system composed of upper and lower halves (1956: 39).

Redfield considers stability and tradition primary aspects of the national states he examines. The peasant communities compose the "Little Tradition"; the national elites compose the "Great Tradition". The governing mechanism of the society is the transmission of tradition.

> The peasant has given his hostage to the fortune of a society and mode of life that is both like his and yet alien to it. He keeps the integrity of his traditions by making compromises: by selling his grain in the town, paying his taxes respecting the priest or the political leader, acknowledging that there are perhaps better things out there than his own village (1956: 10).

Consequent to tradition and its transmission (read: social integration) being of central importance in the existence of state societies, Redfield believes the function of the anthropologist is to study "those social relations that communicate the higher dimension of civilization to the lower or peasant dimension" (1956: 39). Discussing communities with social relations beyond the bounds of locality, Redfield sees social structure as a system of "social fields" and "social networks".

Redfield adapts the term "social field" and "social network" from Barne's use of them in his article, "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish". According to Barnes, the local parish and parishioners are connected to the national state in three ways: 1) the territorially-based social field, by which the local parish and community are connected to larger, extra-local administrative institutions such as hamlets, wards and diocese; 2) the market, by which each fisherman's

social field connects him to the national and international fishing industry, and; 3) the network which connects rural people to one another, through more informal means than 1) and 2) (Barnes, 1954).

Redfield adapts this use of social field and social network to the study of peasant society. In peasant societies the territorially based social field connects the culturally distinct peasant communities and the national, urban elites through the latter group's local representatives -- priests, government officials, intelligentsia, etc. The market operates to tie the economic activity of the peasantry to the national state. The peasant sells his produce in town so that he can pay taxes and rent. Redfield, though, doesn't discuss at length how the market connects the national elites to the peasantry. Redfield uses the term "network" to denote "the country-wide network" of direct or indirect relations between people through kinship, friendship, or common interest.

On the surface it appears that Redfield's discussion of peasant societies is a significant reformulation of the domain and task of anthropology. In comparison to the model of the isolated, culturally homogeneous and self-contained primitive community, peasant communities form part of a larger national state. The social structure of the peasant community includes the rural representatives of the national elites and thus the social relations of the community extend far beyond its physical boundaries. Peasant culture is a part-culture which depends on the transmission of elements of the Great Tradition for its own coherence and reproduction. If anthropologists

are to study peasant society and culture, or the civilization of national states, then they must study the social and cultural relations between the peasant community and the national state of which it is a part.

Redfield's conceptualization of state society and his proposals for its study do not, however, indicate qualitative shifts in anthropology beyond the parochialism of the traditional model. Redfield sees peasant society basically as an enlargement of primitive society, as shown in his discussion of India:

> It is as if the characteristic social structure of the primitive self-contained community had been dissected out and its components spread about a wide area. Rural India is a primitive or a tribal society rearranged to fit a civilization (1956:34).

The national state, seen as two part-cultures within one culture, does not indicate a social form which operates on principles much different than that of primitive society--the concern is still with the transmission of tradition, albeit on an extended and more differentiated scale, between bounded social units. As these social units are primarily defined in cultural and behavioural terms, the analysis of state society eventually dissolves into the study of an aggregate of individuals:

> From this point of view a civilization is an organization of specialists, of kinds of role-occupiers in characteristic relations to one another and to lay people and performing characteristic functions concerned with the transmission of tradition (1956: 58).

Because Redfield does not conceive of state societies as significantly or qualitatively different from primitive societies, he focuses on quantitative differences--state society

is larger and more heterogeneous than primitive society; it is composed of two halves, the urban and the rural, and each person has an extended set of relationships. This kind of logic leads Redfield to bypass the systematic development of analytic and methodological tools for the study of state society. He, thus, acknowledges that viewing the peasant community as a part-culture and a part-society is merely an extension of the earlier, abstract anthropological model of the primitive community. Redfield's initial, well-founded attack on the traditional model ends up in relativistic reconciliation:

> But whether one says that the concept of the folk society must be changed, or whether one simply says that the peasant village in which one works is different, in noted respects, from the model, is not a very important matter. What is important is that the minds of anthropologists are directed to the study of societies that depart from the model for the reason that those societies are bound with towns and cities, because national institutions are present in them, because the townsman and the more rustic person dwell in the same community but lead somewhat different lives (1956: 11).

Thus the attempt to evaluate and reformulate anthropology merely results in piece-meal adjustments, allowing anthropologists to shift their focus to new forms of society without purging the distortions and biases caused by the traditional model. This is, of course, in spite of the fact that Redfield founded what we now know as urban anthropology.

3. Urban Anthropology: The Present State of the Field

Distortions continue to plague urban anthropology even though it has been recognized as a genuine field of social and cultural anthropology since the 1960's. These distortions

stem from the notion that the city is a unique social form or type. As we have seen, this conceptualization of the city appeared in the works of the early urban social theorists, and was further developed by the Chicago school. Robert Redfield combined the notion of the city as a distinct social form with cultural anthropology's habit of treating social groups as bounded homogeneous units, culturally defined, and whose relations with other groups are primarily cultural--it is thus easy to see why Redfield's synthesis has had such a popular appeal in urban anthropology.

Despite the criticism of the concept of the urban-rural dichotomy, anthropologists generally regard the city as a distinct cultural entity. This point is made most strongly by Mitchell when he states that urban and rural institutions are completely distinct, since they are separate social systems (1966: 47-8). Eames and Goode also stress the notion of the city as a separate part of society. To them, the city is a socio-cultural system with unique characteristics that influences the institutionalized subsystems within it. The city is thus seen as an independent variable (1977: 252). Arensberg supports the basic assumption from a somewhat different perspective, by arguing that culture and community can be equated at any level--including the city--because cultural elements are supposedly integrated at the community level (Weaver and White, 1972: 118).

The notion of the city as a distinct socio-cultural system begs the question of a typology of cities. Indeed, most of the writers with the perspective outlined above stress the

need for the development of a sociocultural typology of urban formations. One common way of deriving an urban typology is to compare behaviour and social interaction in selected urban and rural settings, as Provencher, 1972,and Mangin, 1970, have attempted to do. Leeds, 1968, proposes that urban typologies be based on the differential roles of cities within the national framework--the industrial city, the administrative city, etc. Fox attempts to develop an urban typology by differentiating cities according to their "cultural contexts" and their relations with their hinterlands (1977).

The essential characteristics of such typologies, despite their variations, are prefigured in Redfield's "Orthogenetic" and"Heterogenetic" cities. Even when the city is studied as one segment of a total social system, it is still characterized as a distinct cultural unit, which results in social roles and functions being attributed to the city which should be attributed to social relations; relations between urban and rural social groups are portrayed as relations between the rural group and the city itself. Arensberg's urban typology, for example, fails to account for cultural, class or caste differentiation within the city (Weaver and White, 1972: 118). Fox's attempt to overcome the traditional anthropological assumption that primitive communities are homogeneous and self-contained, by studying cities in relation to their hinterlands, is more sophisticated than Arensberg's model in that it takes into account urban heterogeneity and places the city within the context of the nation-state. It is, however, basically a restatement of Redfield: the emphasis on cultural and ideological ties between

city and country are equivalent to the "Great Tradition" and the "Little Tradition", and "urban adaptation" is a reformulation of Redfield's notion of the transmission of those traditions. Fox's notion of the nation-state is also misleading in that, following Redfield's largely quantitative definition of the nation-state, Fox differentitates nation-states according to their level of technological development, bypassing such key issues as social class and class antagonisms.

The recognition of urban heterogeneity, as compared to the supposed homogeneity of the primitive community, has given rise to a concern in urban anthropology to explain the organizing principles or integrating mechanisms of urban social groups. Foster and Kemper articulate this issue, how it poses itself to anthropologists, and how they account for it in their urban research:

> In urban research the anthropologist faces one insurmountable problem: defining a population in the holistic context taken for granted in rural fieldwork...Selecting and delineating the urban population segment to be investigated is the critical first step in urban anthropological research.
> Once this decision is made, another issue emerges: should the anthropologist concentrate on the internal structure of the group or on the relations of its members to the rest of the urban population? Most anthropologists, following the community study approach, have chosen the former (1974: 9).

The authors are quick to point out that Leeds has criticized the community study approach for failing to account for the effects that inter-group relations have on a group's internal structure. However, common to both the community study approach and the inter-group approach is the assumption that the city is a distinct cultural formation and social relations between

and within urban population groups derive from the culture of the city. This assumption is unconsciously expressed by Foster and Kemper in the following passage:

> ...anthropological urban studies have dealt largely with urbanization, the process by which rural emigrants settle in and adjust to urban life, rather than the way of life of cities, which is commonly referred to as urbanism (1974: 7).

Saying that immigrants adjust to urban life is simply another way of saying that there is a way of life of cities, and that it is this way of life that integrates the various urban social groups and determines the internal structures of groups. This assumption is present in all of the major anthropological approaches to urban studies, including kinship, network and ethnic studies.

Kinship studies continue to be an important facet of anthropological urban analysis, as they were in anthropological studies of primitive societies. Urban kinship studies began with Lewis, who, as noted earlier, refuted the sociological assumption that family cohesion disintegrated under the impact of urbanization (Lewis, 1952). In his "culture of poverty" studies, Lewis assumes that the family is the basic social unit of urban lower class emigrants (Lewis, 1961; 1965; 1966). Hsu goes even further than Lewis, arguing that the family is the primary integrative institution of urban society (Hsu, 1965; 1971; Weaver and White, 1972: 119). Migration studies in general strongly emphasize the role of kinship in promoting both emigration to the city as well as subsequent adjustment patterns of emigrants (Friedmann and Wulff, 1976; Eames and Goode, 1977).

Although urban anthropological studies of urban kinship patterns have illuminated the continuing importance of kinship and the family in the urban social fabric, the tendency is to assume that kinship helps people adjust to an assumed urban culture. This assumption necessarily reduces the possibility for understanding the real role of kinship in social relations. This distortion is particularly apparent in studies where kinship assumes an all important integrative role, as in the work of Lewis and Hsu. Lewis's "culture of poverty" concept, which claims that poor people become acculturated to urban poverty through kinship mechanisms, has been subjected to severe criticism for its tendency to isolate social groups and displace the causes of urban poverty onto the poor themselves (Valentine, 1968).

A considerable amount of effort has been devoted to elucidating mechanisms other than kinship which tend to integrate urban social groups. A major focus of urban anthropology, following the leads of Barnes and Redfield has been the analysis of urban social networks. Network studies generally represent an advance over the kinds of urban studies that assume the locus of inter-personal relations to take place in small bounded units. The assumption common to most network studies is that rural social interaction takes place in closed and long-lasting social units, while urban social interaction takes place in free-floating and transitory social units (Kushner, 1970: 95). Factors other than kinship, such as economic and political conditions are often included in the description of network patterns. As Mitchell asserts:

> ...the sociological interest in African urban studies must be on the way in which the behaviour of town dwellers fits into, and is adjusted to, the social matrix created by the commercial, industrial and administrative framework of a modern metropolis (1966: 38).

Network studies thus attempt to account for the heterogeneity of conditions influencing urban social life. Other assumptions, however, tend to counteract the positive effects of network analysts who assume the heterogeneity of urban social life. Like the bulk of urban kinship studies, network studies accept the notion that the city is a distinct cultural entity. Mitchell, for example, begins his influential article, "Theoretical Orientations in African Studies", by stating:

> Towns and cities everywhere stand out as distinct social phenomena in which the ways of life of their inhabitants manifestly is in sharp contrast to that of the neighbouring countrymen (1966: 37).

Mitchell later adds that "urban social relations should be viewed as a system in their own right." It is this amorphous urban culture, rather than the political and economic framework of the city, which supposedly governs urban social patterns. Indeed, not only do political and economic conditions remain abstract in network analysis, the networks themselves are given pre-eminence:

> ...at present the tactics of research seem to be first of all to explore those fields of activities and relationships which can be demonstrated as being related to one another and then, when the network of interconnected activities and relationships in these different fields has been specified, to attempt to see their connection at a higher level of abstraction (1966: 60).

The city itself remains, on the one hand, an abstract cultural entity, and on the other, a purely empirical construct, a "network of networks".

Given its basic assumptions, network analysis is incapable of achieving a structural analysis of the subject of its study. The individual is taken as the starting point of analysis. The network is considered to be the aggregation of individuals with whom ego interacts. What is studied are the behaviour or activity patterns of arbitrarily selected individuals over an equally arbitrary period of time. The only "higher level of abstraction" that such an approach is capable of is a description of the aggregate of behaviour patterns of all the individuals in the network. Such descriptions accomplish very little, given the fact that networks are free-floating and transitory.

Ethnic studies also attempt to account for the cultural heterogeniety, as well as the cultural integration of cities. Ethnicists generally consider ethnicity to be a response to urban complexity. Cohen, one of the leading figures of urban ethnic studies, thus defines ethnicity in the following terms:

> Ethnicity is essentially a form of interaction between culture groups operating within common social contexts. It is for this reason that the phenomena of ethnicity are so dramatically evident in cities (1974: xi).

Even though it is common to assume that an ethnic group is based on a common culture of origin, there are at least two tendencies within ethnic studies. One tendency, originated by Barth, emphasizes ethnicity as a cognitive category. Individuals identify themselves with a particular

ethnic group, and are identified by others as being a member of that group. The maintenance of ethnic boundaries thus becomes important not only for the individual's continuing identification with the group but also for the persistence of the group itself (Barth, 1969).

The "ethnic identity"approach has been further developed by De Vos and Romanucci-Ross, who maintain that ethnic identity is the prominent influence on a person's self-identity. They give more recognition than Barth does, however, to the actual cultural elements of a group, such as language, religion and territory, with which an individual identifies:

> The ethnic identity of a group of people consists of their subjective symbolic or emblematic use of any aspect of culture, in order to differentiate themselves from other groups (De Vos and Romanucci-Ross, 1975: 16).

De Vos and Romanucci-Ross also recognize that ethnicity occurs within a heterogeneous environment and is influenced by economic and political conditions, so that ethnic identity may weaken or strengthen or shift emphasis under political or economic constraints.

The other tendency in ethnic studies emphasizes the behavioural and structural dimensions of ethnicity. Cohen, 1974, and Eastman, 1975, criticized the concept of ethnicity as a subjective sense of self-identity for obscuring differences in the degree of ethnicity. They are particularly critical of the inability of the ethnic identity approach to account for dissimilar behaviour within an ethnic unit. To Cohen, Mitchell and other representatives of the behavioural approach to ethnicity,

an ethnic group consists of people who share normative behavioural patterns. They consider the continuity of interpersonal interactions more important than cultural continuities or cognitive identification in explaining ethnicity (Buechler and Buechler, 1973: 17).

Cohen, moreover, studies ethnic groups within the context of political and economic influences:

> The cultures of ethnic groups are universes of such formally non-political formations and activities that are politicized in the course of social action (1974: xvi).

The political and economic context here is made much more explicit than it is in the "ethnic identity" approach. In one study, for example, Cohen compares Hausa traders in Yoruba towns with City men (London's economic elite), and concludes that both groups use cultural symbolism to "articulate organizational functions that cannot be formally institutionalized" (1974: xxi).

The tendency of ethnic studies represented by Cohen goes much further than the Barthian approach in explaining the internal structure of ethnic groups and how ethnic groups relate to the larger social context. Nevertheless, Cohen relies upon the Barthian model for much of his explanation of ethnicity. Thus, he may describe Hausa traders and City men in terms of the normative behaviour of each group, but he explains such behaviour in terms of the maniuplation of cultural symbols. This approach is different than Barth's primarily in the greater degree to which it focuses on behaviour. The focus on behaviour itself is not due so much to a greater recognition of the poli-

tical and economic context of ethnicity as it is the extension of network analysis to ethnic studies. The social system in which ethnic groups exist is, for the most part, left unexplained, and is accepted as a given. Thus, Eames and Goode, who favour Cohen's approach, claim that Cohen's major point is that Hausa ethnicity is a response to urban life (1977: 179). But this revelation basically leaves urban anthropology where it began--setting up "urban culture" as an ideal type, and explaining urban social relations by saying that they are responses to the culture of the city.

4. Conclusion

It may be true that cities do, in certain respects differ culturally from the country. Even so, this does not justify the primary operating assumption of urban anthropology that "urban culture" is an independent explanatory variable. Such a formulation places severe limitations on the ability to study and explain both the social relations within the city and the relations between the city and the social system in which it is embedded.

The modus operendi of urban anthropology first appeared in the sociological writings of Simmel, Tönnies and Weber. These men attributed the rise of the modern metropolis to the supposed autonomy that the town possessed within European feudalism. By extension, the breakdown of modern social life was regarded as being the result of the modern city itself, rather than the social relations or the social system which gave coherence to the modern city.

The theory of the city as a distinct social form was completed and extended by the Chicago school of sociology which, following Durkeim's emphasis on social order and integration posited the city not only as the source of social breakdown but also as the mediator and integrator of the various cultural elements contained within it. Under the Chicago school urban sociological investigation came to be focused on small bounded units and the "immediately apparent context of individual association" (Mellor, 1977: 5). In other words, urban sociology became highly empiricist, describing individual and interpersonal behaviour patterns, and explaining behaviour as being the result of the physical and cultural characteristics of the city as a socio-cultural type.

Urban anthropology emerged out of the efforts of cultural anthropologists to 1) refute the extension of the findings of the Chicago school's studies of Chicago to cities of all cultures, and; 2) extend the scope of anthropology by studying social change and modernization, particularly the urbanization and subsequent adaptation of formerly agrarian social groups. The acceptance, however, on the part of urban anthropology, of the essential premises of both urban sociology and cultural anthropology from the outset limited the effectiveness of the discipline. In recent years several urban anthropologists have explained the theoretical and methodological malaise of the field as being due to the emphasis on the study of small-scale population units (the focus of urban sociology and cultural anthropology) as if they were the self-contained isolates studied by anthropologists in rural settings. These critics

contend that to overcome the malaise in urban anthropology, cities should be considered in their "cultural contexts" and interactions between different groups should be studied in addition to the prevailing focus on internal group structure (Leeds, 1968; Eames and Goode, 1977; Fox, 1977).

The abstract character of the traditional model--the self-contained bounded social unit--was already recognized by Redfield in his later writings. The crucial point that the more recent critics, like Redfield, ignore is that that the initial reification of the abstract model is the one that posits the city as a distinct cultural type or form. Not recognizing this feature of past and current anthropological practice, their attempts at reformulating urban anthropology reproduce the very distortions of the earlier models. Take for example, the controversy surrounding the "Culture of Poverty" approach of Oscar Lewis. This approach has been criticised almost unanimously by urban anthropologists for its tendency to disfigure the culture concept by claiming that the poor become acculturated to their low socio-economic position and that this acculturation prevents them from striving for or achieving upward mobility. The theoretical and methodological premises of the "culture of poverty" notion are not, however, too far removed from those of mainstream urban anthropology. The "culture of poverty" approach first defines a social unit, isolates it from its larger historical and social context, then studies the behaviour and interpersonal interactions of individuals in the group, from whence characteristics of the group are derived. This is the same basic pattern that is

common to ethnic studies, network studies and kinship studies.

All of the major currents of urban anthropology accept the premise that the city is a distinct socio-cultural form. One of the primary results of this premise is that urban-rural relations are distorted. This is the case, not only in Redfield's notion of the folk-urban dichotomy, but in contemporary revisions of the notion, such as Fox's and Eames and Goode's emphasis on studing cities in their "cultural contexts", and the various urban typologies, including that of Leeds. Invariably such studies treat the city and the country as separate social systems. Urban-rural relations are regarded as relations between different social forms, rather than as social relations between groups. At the same time, cities themselves are seen as the harbingers of social change. Thus we see the prevalence of such phrases of thought as the "cultural roles of cities" (Redfield, Fox), which attribute functions to cities which are actually performed by and through social groups. But urban anthropologists are unable to understand social relations between urban and rural groupings because of their overwhelming focus on individual behaviour and behavioural adaptation to "urban culture". Unable to understand social relations, it follows that they are unable to explain social change, except as change between the two abstract entities of country and city, or as the ultra-empiricist change in individual behaviour.

If the premises of urban anthropology have prevented the construction of viable analysis of urban-rural social relations, they have no less prevented the understanding of urban social relations. Basically, the assumption that the

city is an independent variable leads to the treatment of social relations as being determined by "urban culture". The problem thus becomes one of describing how people adjust to the norms of urban life, and how people are integrated in the urban social fabric. Kinship, networks and ethnicity are, then, viewed as the primary integrative mechanisms acting on the behalf of "urban culture". In urban anthropology kinship, ethnicity and network refer primarily to cognitive or behavioural modes of integration. Such studies then focus on individuals or small, bounded population units. But to fully explain the behavioural and cognitive patterns of individuals or groups requires an examination of the structure of social relations, within their total social and historical context, a point well made by Valentine:

> A full understanding of any one stratum or segment will require considerable elucidation of the larger system within which it is embedded. The primary dimension of relationships between social categories is the dimension defining the categories themselves such as social class to social class (1968: 121).

By maintaining that "urban culture" defines urban social relations, and that "urban culture" is defined either by kinship patterns, social networks, ethnicity, or by some combination of the three, urban anthropology denies itself the possibility of understanding either the city or the social units that are the focus of study.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CITY AND THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

1. Urban Anthropology and the Study of Class

Urban anthropologists have not entirely ignored the influence of class on urban-rural relations or on urban social relations. Many studies have been concerned with the relationship between class and ethnicity, class and kinship, or class and social network. However, such studies generally portray class as distinctly secondary to other variables.

Ethnicity is often put forward as a more crucial variable effecting social life than class. De Vos and Romanucci-Ross argue that ethnic identity is as strong as class conflict, and that ethnicity is presently the primary source of social change in the United States (1975: 23). In a similar vein Van Den Berghe maintains that the fundamental social division in pluralistic societies is based on ethnicity (1973: 967). Network analysts often recognize the existence of a relationship between network and class. But the dominant view, as expressed by Bott, the dean of network studies, is that the network is the primary influence on the lives of network members (Eames and Goode, 1977: 126, 139). Eames and Goode make the observation that most kinship studies that consider class treat it as a static variable (1977: 147). Indeed, Hsu, Lewis and others regard kinship as a much more important

integrative factor than class in urban settings (Weaver and White, 1972: 119).

Even when urban anthropologists are not relegating class to a distinctly secondary explanatory position, it is thought of in very narrow terms. Eames and Goode allege that the concept of class is not amenable to ethnographic research because a class is not a historically or geographically bounded unit--an odd argument to come from authors who are generally critical of urban anthropology's parochial focus on self-contained social units (1977: 198). They believe that it is because of the difficulty of studying class empircally that urban anthropologists have studied narrower categories such as status communities, careers and workplaces. In accordance with their emphasis on the city as an independant variable, Eames and Goode suggest that such studies should examine the effects of the "urban context" on the units under investigation.

Urban anthropologists who have retained the concept of class in their studies have generally approached social classes as if they were simply cultural units or collective strategies for adaptation to the city. Warner, for example, was not concerned with the relationship between classes and the division of labour, but with classes as bounded cultural units in which the individual members share some sense of identity (Eames and Goode, 1977: 207). Cohen believes that class is a useful analytical tool, but, referring to African conditions he defines classes as "categories of people sharing common political and economic interests arising from their access to public

authorities and public resources and opportunities which they control" (quoted in Basham and DeGroot, 1977: 426). This definition bypasses the underlying reasons for the differential distribution of economic and political power and portrays classes merely as aggregates of individuals.

Severe limitations are placed on the utility of the class concept by defining it in narrow cultural or behavioural terms. In addition, the assumption that the city is a distinct cultural form which is, nevertheless, socially heterogenous, leads to an overriding propensity to describe class as a mechanism of cultural integration. Such a formulation leaves us at the study of individual actors adapting to an amorphous urban culture, and connected to each other either at the empirical level of networks or integrated by an equally amorphous moral order or collective sense of identity.

2. The City as a Product of the Social Division of Labour

The examination of individual behaviour or various forms of identity do not tell us why such things exist or why social changes takes place. What is required is an understanding of the structural causes of the patterns of social relations and the changes that occur in them. If the concept of class is approached in this way then it can become a viable theoretical and methodological tool for the study of urban social relations. A structural study of class can be developed by examining classes within a definite social division of labour and the system of property relations characterising a society. A class is constituted by the relationship which the group as a whole has

to the process of production and thereby to other classes. The prerequisite for the emergence of class society is the ability of one class to appropriate the surplus product of the direct producers. The mode of appropriation of the social surplus will largely determine the social relations between classes. However, relations of production are not simply economic, for political and ideological means are used by the class of appropriators to maintain the production and distribution of a surplus. In other words, the reproduction of the conditions of production and appropriation of a surplus are as important in maintaining class society as are the actual methods of production and appropriation.

The city is the product of class society, because the existence of the city depends upon the continuous creation of a significant social surplus, and its appropriation and concentration by a non-producing class. In his book, Social Justice and the City, David Harvey articulates the relationship between the social division of labour and the city:

> There can be no urbanism and no hierarchy of urban centres unless there is some significant hierarchical ordering in the social structure ...Cities are formed through the geographic concentration of a social surplus product, which the mode of economic integration must therefore be capable of producing and concentrating (1973: 209, 216).

Many pre-class societies produced a social surplus, but both the level of production and the social relations of production inhibited the development of towns or cities. In primitive hunting and gathering or agricultural societies, production was discontinuous--there was no complusion to produce an ex-

tensive surplus. The methods and techniques of exploitation of resources demanded a more or less constant movement of population and in many cases periodic splitting of the community so as not to exhaust the subsistence base or aggravate social tensions. When surplus was produced it was not appropriated by a class of non-producers, because the level of production was too low to permanently sustain such a class, and the social relations prohibited it: surplus was not defined privately, but socially; surplus was distributed reciprocally or was collectively consumed in feasts and festivals.

Such societies, then, with their generally low level of production and social relations which prohibit the formation of classes, cannot sustain urban growth. The exception that proves the rule is pre-Columbian Mayan society, which at some point in its history underwent a change in its social structure whereby a certain amount of production was geared to the creation and maintenance of urban centres. It appears that a group of priests were able to separate themselves from the fetters of clan organization, while at the same time usurping social power which allowed them to appropriate social surplus for their private consumption. Surplus was collected and concentrated in urban centres under the pretext of fulfilling collective religious ceremonies (Redfield, 1956: 44).

Long before the arrival of Coumbus, however, the urban centres of the Mayas were abandoned. The probable reason for this is that the priests were not able to appropriate a surplus large enough and constantly enough to maintain themselves.

If this is the case, then essentially the priests were not able to fully transform the social structure from one based on clan to one based on class. The evidence seems to be that the peasant producers moved away from the urban sites, which would indicate that they were unwilling, after a certain point, to support the private interests of the priests with their own social surplus product. This they were able to do because they had not formed significant settled rural communities, necessary both for continuous agricultural production and for the centralized authority to have control over them.

The fact that cities emerge from and depend upon the appropriation of the surplus labour of one class by another does not justify the positing of a historic abstractions about cities or "urban culture" in general. In one of their earliest discourses on historical development, Marx and Engels stress the importance of the emergence and development of the city:

> The greatest division of material and mental labour is the separation of town and country. The antagonism between town and country begins with the transition from tribe to state, from locality to nation, and runs through the whole history of civilization to the present day (1970: 68-9).

Taken in isolation, this passage could be interpreted to mean that Marx and Engels posit an insurmountable division between town and country. However, despite the generality of the statement, the authors do account for urban-rural differences, not on the basis of the autonomous development of distinct social forms, but as emerging from the social division of

labour. Specifically, the existence of urban settlements implies the development of new forms of property relations:

> The separation of town and country can also be understood as the separation of capital and landed property, as the beginning of the existence and development of capital independent of landed property--the beginning of property having its basis only in labour and exchange (1970: 69) [emphasis mine].

The important point here is that the division of labour and the property relations it engenders develop historically. The city is not a priori distinct from the country. Nor are relations of production in the city a priori distinct from those in the country. As long as production is based on property relations dependent on the ownership of land, then the city's development will be dependent on the country. When the primary production relations are no longer based on the ownership of land, but of capital and labour, then these relations, while concentrated in the city, will become generalized throughout the society. This dialectical interplay between city and country, articulated through the division of labour and dominant property relations, is elemental in Marx's later periodization of historical development which he sets forth in the Pre Capitalist Economic Formations:

> Ancient classical history is the history of cities, but cities based on landownership and agriculture; Asian history is a kind of undifferentiated unity of town and country (the large city, properly speaking must be regarded as merely a princely camp, superimposed on the real economic structure); the Middle Ages (Germanic period) starts with the countryside as the locus of history, whose further development then proceeds through the opposition of town

> and country; modern (history) is the urbanization of the countryside, not, as among the ancients, the ruralization of the city (1965: 69-70).

In other words, the development of the city has a long and diverse history which is in no way independent of social development in general. The division of labour existing in society at a given time will tend to 1) allow or not allow the existence of cities; 2) determine urban social relations, and; 3) determine urban-rural social relations.

In a social system in which production is primarily agricultural, the maintenance of the city, and more particularly of the non-labouring classes will depend upon the continued reproduction of those relations of production in the country which allow for the creation and appropriation of a surplus. Sardei-Bierman, a Marxist who writes on urban issues, is wrong to state as a general case that cities are distinguished from the country by different social relations of production (1976: 125). Such a formulation differs from urban anthropology's premise that the city is a distinct cultural type in that it seeks social causality in the division of labour. Sardei-Beirman, however, no less than anthropologists, reifies the city by taking the appearance of its distinctiveness for absolute, supra-historical reality. An examination of the historical development of the city within the framework of the social division of labour proves the falsity of any form of positing the city as an independent social institution.

Greek and Roman cities were dependent on agricultural

production, so much so that they never developed an autonomous "urban" economy (Anderson, 1974: 19). Even the extensive inter-urban trade was primarily the trade of agricultural produce. But the character of classical urban civilization was not just based on agricultural production. Bookchin, who in most respects follows Marx's historical analysis of cities claims that Athenian life, Athenian civic spirit, was based not on slavery or patriarchalism but on yeoman values and virtues, and on "men of strong character" (1974: 27). Bookchin's argument, besides being tautological, leads him to downplay the social division of labour and the class differences arising from it.

The existence of an urban citizenry not engaged in agricultural production was clearly based upon slave labour. While slave labour also flourished in the cities, its presence on the land, and the urban ruling class's extraction of the slave's surplus product by right of ownership and citizenship made possible the concentration of landowners in the cities. In his account of the ancient mode of production, Anderson concurs with the position that holds the fundamental importance of slavery for urban development:

> Slavery was thus the economic hinge that joined town and country together, to the inordinate profit of the polis. It both maintained the capitive agriculture that permitted the dramatic differentiation of an urban ruling class from its rural origins, and promoted the inter-city trade that was the compliment of this agriculture in the Mediterranean (1974: 25).

The predominance of slave-labour created the conditions for the grandiose cultural and urban development of the ancient Mediterranean. Slavery, however, also set the limits to the development and existence of these societies. The reproduction of society entailed the reproduction of the social relations of production, of the slaves on the one hand and the citizen-proprietors on the other. The primary means of securing slaves was through warfare, the subjugation of previously independant peoples. Warfare was also the order of the day for the lateral extension of the economy, because: 1) slave production inhibited technological advance and the formation of a complex division of labour, and hence set definite limits to productivity within regions already dominated by slavery, and: 2) economies of scale of slave production required that land ownership not be constantly subdivided.

Slavery thus set the limits to the economic advance of the system, while at the same time necessitating expansionary policies of the ruling classes. The warfare which was necessary for the functioning of the system paradoxically led to the growing impoverishment and ruination of the rural small-holders and the disruption of agricultural production. The suffrocation of those societies forged by the ancient mode of production resulted not so much from barbarian invasions but the internal destruction of the agricultural base. Countless classical cities disappeared or were reduced to villages because the "economic hinge" joining city and country was increasingly undermined; agricultural production could not continue to support the urban citizenry, and the cities themselves contained no self-sustaning economy.

It is clear that we cannot understand ancient cities as entities independent from the countryside. Just as important, however, is the consideration that the relationship is not simply one between two social forms. The basis for the particular relationship between ancient towns and the country was the social division of labour characteristic of the Mediterranean at the time. Looking at the towns of feudal Europe, we can again say that the relationship between town and country was not primarily a relationship between two different social forms, but rather was the expression of the social division of labour. The division of labour in European feudalism was much different than that of the ancient mode of production, and this explains the unique urban-rural relations of the period.

The feudal mode of production, as Anderson notes, was a gradual recombination and synthesis of the "decomposing slave mode of production and the distended and deformed primitive modes of the Germanic invader" (1974: 18). The primitive modes of the German tribes were not deformed originally, however, just as the primitive societies from which the ancient city-states emerged were not deformed in origin. In both cases the societies evolved historically and were transformed during the course of their development. The social formations of the Germanic invaders had originally been based along kinship lines. Two processes intervened to change the social organization into one based on class lines. First, the invasion and conquest of the Roman empire fostered the tendency toward the military organization of society, which in turn led to social strati-

fication. Second, the division of land and the administration of conquered areas created the material conditions for social organization to become based on territory and property relations (Engels, 1972: 311).

As feudalism became constituted as a mode of production, the primary relations of production that developed were those between the feudal lords and the peasants and serfs. Unlike the slaves of antiquity, feudal peasants generally owned their instruments of labour, had rights to the use of the land, and retained a portion of their production for their own use. The peasant had definite obligations to his seigneur, however, in the form of giving up a part of his surplus production, working on seigneurial land, or paying a cash rent to the seigneur (Dobb, 1963: 35). The predominance of agrarian social relations is what Marx had in mind when he said that the Middle Ages start with "the countryside as the locus of history."

The further historical development and dissolution of European feudalism, indeed, the emergence of the capitalist mode of production proceeded from the opposition between town and country. This is not to say, though, that it was the town as a unique social form and an independent variable that caused the decay of feudalism and the growth of capitalism. Feudal towns were not "alien" institutions, and were in the beginning subject to feudal authority. It is probable that many feudal towns were initiated by feudal institutions. Feudal lords had an interest in having trading intersections within their

territory, both to acquire luxury goods and increase their wealth by exacting levies and tolls on merchants and traders (Dobb, 1963: 71, 78).

Nevertheless, the two forms of economic activity characteristic of the feudal towns--trade and petty commodity production--tended to have a cumulatively dissolvent affect upon the feudal mode of production. In particular, urban merchants attempted to acquire and maintain economic advantages for the towns by imposing restrictions on rural craft production and trade. But the merchant class that arose with the growth of trade and commodity production depended upon the primitive market conditions of feudalism to maintain their trading monopolies. It was in the objective interest of this merchant class to uphold, or at least not to struggle to overthrow the primary agrarian social relations.

However, beginning in the sixteenth century, important changes were taking place in the agricultural sphere, particularly in England. The growth of the textile industry demanded larger quantities of wool, and large-landowners profited from this demand by confiscating the peasantry's common lands and turning them into sheep-walks. This in turn meant that both the feudal form of production, which had not been primarily production for the market, and the direct producers--the peasants--were not being reproduced. Without this reproduction of the basic feudal relations and organization of production, the system itself could not continue. At the same time, changes were taking place in urban commodity production. Among the urban crafstmen and merchants emerged an element that saw

greater opportunities for accumulation in the direct employment of wage labourers, rather than in the dependent and restrictive master-journeyman relationship. The appearance of this new production relation, between the capitalists who owned the means of production and the propertyless proletarians who had nothing to sell but their labour-power, signalled the emergence of the capitalist mode of production:

> The subordination of production to capital, and the appearance of this class relationship between capitalist and the producer is ...to be regarded as the crucial watershed between the old mode of production and the new even if the technical changes that we associate with the industrial revolution were needed both to complete the transition and to afford scope for the full maturing of the capitalist mode of production and of the great increase in the productive power of human labour associated with it (Dobb, 1963: 143).

3. Capitalist Cities, Urbanization, and Immigration

The emergence and development of capitalism cannot be inferred from the supposed autonomy of the feudal town as a unique social form. In the first place, early feudal towns existed at the mercy of feudal lords, and their apparent independence was simply the result of the generalized parcelling of sovereignty under the feudal mode of production (Anderson, 1974: 147). Later, when severe urban-rural conflicts occurred, these were not between the town and country *per se*, but between urban merchants attempting to maintain and extend their trading monopolies and the rural and provincial merchants and craftsmen (Dobb, 1963: 97).

In the second place, in England at least, the capitalist division of labour did not originally take root in the advanced feudal towns but in peasant villages. In the towns, capitalists who wished to invest their capital directly in the employment of wage-labour were restricted both by the powerful merchant interests and by laws that limited labour mobility (Dobb, 1963: 119). Therefore, the emergent capitalist elements established themselves in the countryside, where they could own and control the means of production and have access to labour unrestricted by guild regulations.

Thus, the town as an autonomous entity is not a causal factor in the emergence of capitalism.

> Nothing illustrates better the limitations of the concept of 'urban economy' and the economic dualism of town and country which it presupposes, than the fact that capital first seizes control of the productive process outside the town.... (Merrington, 1975: 87).

However, once the villages become the loci of capitalist production, they undergo a transformation whereby they rapidly become manufacturing towns, and later, industrial cities, continually drawing in remnants of the rural population, and seemingly exerting a dominant force over social processes. Indeed, the modern epoch can be characterized in part as the "urbanization of the countryside".

Nevertheless, to assume that the process of urbanization is independent of the relations of production and the productive forces of the capitalist system, is to mystify both urbanization and social relations. For capitalist production

to occur, the capitalist must own the means of production and hire labourers to work them. He appropriates the surplus-value created in the production process, that is, the value created by the labourer over and above the cost of the reproduction of his labour-power. To ensure the continuous creation of surplus-value, the capitalist must reinvest a part of his capital in the upkeep and renewal of the means of production and in the daily employment of labour. This reinvestment of capital is called the accumulation of capital (Marx, 1959: 543).

In its early phases the capitalist division of labour was relatively simple, consisting of a capitalist owning or controling a shop and the tools and materials therein, and employing a number of craftsmen to work on the various steps of the production of a particular commodity. This relatively simple division of labour in manufacture, however, is the foundation for more advanced forms of production (Marx, 1959: 339, 344). Once a number of labourers are collected under one roof, the division of labour among them can at any time be reorganized so as to increase the rate and volume of production. Just as important, various aspects of production can be mechanized to increase efficiency and reduce production costs.

The Industrial Revolution represents that stage of capitalist development during which machines and technology are applied in the production process, converting tasks formerly performed by human labour into ones carried out by machines. Industrialization promotes an increase in the scale of production: factories can be expanded, and the number of labourers

required is consequently greater; a larger volume of a wider range of commodities can be produced. Overall, the division of labour and the productive forces are transformed and extended.

> Everywhere the increased scale of industrial establishments is the starting point for a more comprehensive organization of the work of many, for a wider development of their material motive forces--in other words, for the progressive transformation of isolated processes of production socially combined and scientifically arranged (Marx., 1959: 588).

No sphere of production is left untouched by industrialization. Even agriculture becomes industrialized and is transformed into just another branch of industry, and the secondary refining processes of agricultural products tend to be performed in the urban areas, where the demand, the industrial establishments and the labour force are located.

Thus, urbanization does not represent the extension of the city as an independent entity into the country. Nor does it represent the pull by the city itself on the rural population. Capitalist production in agriculture tends to push labourers out of the countryside by making them superfluous. Concurrently, capitalist production in the urban centres requires large numbers of working people, and so tends to pull the rural population into the towns.

Urbanization is not independent of capitalist development in general. Its apparent autonomy, due simply to the undeniable quantitative growth of urban areas, belies its subjugation to the dictates of the capitalist mode of production.

> Capitalist production, by collecting the population in great centres, and causing an ever-increasing preponderance of town population... concentrates the historical motive force of society...(Marx, 1959: 474).

The growth of the modern industrial city is thus rooted in the development of the capitalist division of labour. Urbanization, on the one hand, is the physical result of the concentration and centralization of capital and labour set in motion by industrialization. On the other hand, it assists in reproducing and reinforcing the centralization and concentration of the productive forces by providing new industry with a ready-made industrial infrastructure--labour supplies, roads, markets, etc.

While technology and mechanization enormously increase the scale of production, they also make human labour redundant in those work-functions that are mechanized. Thus, as industrialization develops, there is a tendency for a proportionately greater number of workers to be displaced.

> The labouring population therefore produces, along with the accumulation of capital produced by it, the means by which it itself is made relatively superfluous , is turned into a relative surplus population; and it does this to an always increasing extent. This is a law of population peculiar to the capitalist mode of production...(Marx, 1959: 591-92).

There are, however, countervailing forces in the capitalist mode of production that foster the need for increased numbers of labourers, despite the tendency of mechanization to repel them. As one branch of industry is mechanized, other branches that supply the first with means of production and materials

require more labour to meet their needs. Moreover, as the general scale of industrialization develops and becomes more complex, new branches of industry arise, existing factories are extended, and infrastruture requirements increase, thus creating an overall increase in the demand for labour. Finally, the developed capitalist industrial system has the capacity to expand production more or less rapidly, depending on the supply of raw materials and labour (Marx, 1959: 417-28). In addition to the tendencies toward population growth induced by the industrial system, the reproduction of the labour force is the prerequisite for the maintenance and extension of the capitalist mode of production. For accumulation to occur, a part of the surplus-value produced by workers must be reinvested in the means of production, and this reinvestment requires additional labour.

Thus, of central importance to the functioning of the productive system are mechanisms to provide a readily available supply of labour. The city functions in part as a reproduction site of the existing labour force. It also contains substantial segments of the relative surplus population, or reserve army of labour, such as the chronically un-or underemployed, as well as those people temporarily thrown out of work by mechanization or plant shut-downs. These groups, who roughly correspond to Marx's categories of 'stagnant'and 'floating' labour, can be reincorporated into the active labour force during periods of increased productivity.

Urban industry, however, cannot rely only on the surplus

urban population to meet its manpower needs. The existence and growth of the urban population is not necessarily substantial enough to meet either paroxysms in productivity or the incessant increase in the scale of production (Holland, 1976: 38). In Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the rural areas furnished the additional labour supplies needed in the urban shops and factories. Agricultural labourers were initially driven off the land by feudal landowners wishing to increase their earnings by turning common lands into sheep-walks. The confiscation of church lands during the Reformation also deprived large numbers of peasants of their livelihood (Marx, 1959: 672, 675). This early period of "primitive accumulation", or separation of labourers from their means of production, forced the urbanization and proletarianization of thousands of peasants. Later, capitalist penetration of agriculture sets the stage for a process of continuous urbanization of displaced rural labourers:

> As soon as capitalist production takes possession of agriculture, and in proportion to the extent to which it does so, the demand for an agricultural labouring population falls absolutely... Part of the agricultural population is therefore constantly on the point of passing over into an urban or manufacturing proletariat, and on the lookout for circumstances favourable to this transformation (Manufacture is used here in the sense of all non-agricultural industries) This source of relative surplus-population is thus constantly flowing (Marx, 1959: 601).

With the full development of industrial capitalism, virtually all rural areas become reserves of "latent" surplus population, permanently subject to the demands of urban industry.

However, the latent and other forms of surplus population serve purposes other than simply catering to the manpower requirements of industry. Capital is constantly striving for higher profits by increasing the intensity and duration of work while at the same time depressing wages or keeping them below the actual value of labour power. The capitalist class is able to increase productivity and curtail any commensurate rise in wages if the working class is not in a position to significantly defend its interests. The existence of a sizable surplus population alongside the active labour force, competing with employed workers for jobs, may enable capitalists to: 1) use the pressure of unemployment to reduce wages; 2) slow down wage increases and; 3) increase the intensity of work (Mandel, 1975: 158). On the other hand, if the supply of active and latent labour is not sufficient to meet the manpower needs of industry, then the working class is in a position to press for higher wages and better working conditions (Marx, 1959: 575). Under such circumstances, however, owners and employers will generally attempt to reduce labour costs by mechanization or by reinvesting capital elsewhere, where labour may be cheaper. This reaction on the part of the capitalist class results in rising unemployment, and thus in the restructuring of the industrial reserve army of labour and, consequently, falling wages (Marx, 1959: 581; Mandel, 1975: 151).

The relative surplus population or industrial reserve army is thus not only the fundamental mechanism in the reproduction of the labour force, but in its reproduction under con-

ditions specific to the capitalist division of labour. The industrial reserve army tends to be the pivot around which the balance of forces between labourers and owners--and hence their respective shares in the national income--are structured. More specifically, the industrial reserve army is the dominant influence in controlling wages:

> Taking them as a whole, the general movements of wages are exclusively regulated by the expansion and contraction of the industrial reserve army, and these again correspond to the periodic changes of the industrial cycle (Marx., 1959: 596).

In the first countries to industrialize the large size of the industrial reserve army tended to weaken the working class and depress wages. However, by the mid-nineteenth century, the scale of industrialization, coupled with the mass emigration of labour-power from Western Europe to North America and other areas, led to a gradual decline in the industrial reserve army, and hence an increase in wages (Mandel, 1975: 81-2). Industrial capitalists then became interested in investing their capital in countries where industrialization had not yet taken place and where there were large reserves of labour.

Although imperialism triggered capitalist development on a world-wide scale, it instituted and reinforced regional economic inequalities. This "uneven" development was due in part to the fact that the domination of Western European capital over accumulation of capital in Africa, Asia and Latin America subjected economic development in the latter regions to the interests of the capitalist classes in the already in-

dustrialized countries (Mandel, 1975: 56). One of the peculiar results of this uneven development has been the on-going construction of sizable reserve armies of labour in the "Third World", due to the slow pace of industrialization and the relatively rapid rate at which peasants and rural labourers are thrown off the land by capitalist penetration of agricultural production (Mandel, 1975: 67). Third World cities thus tend to have large concentrations of un- and underemployed people, and an industrial working class that is low-paid, in comparison to their counterparts in the advanced capitalist countries.

Since the end of World War Two, there has been, in addition to the transfer of surplus-profits from the underdeveloped to the more developed countries, a more or less continuous movement of people from the former to the latter countries. On the one hand, immigration takes place because people see opportunities to acquire a higher price for their labour-power in the advanced industrialized countries, that is, they see the possibility of a higher standard of living elsewhere (Marshall, 1973: 16; Berger, 1975: 33). On the other hand, the on-going industrial expansion in the advanced countries has required the immigration of labour-power, due to the historical decline of their own reserve armies of labour.

Thus, urbanization in the third quarter of the twentieth century has been among other things, a combined process of: 1) rapid urbanization of displaced Third World peasantries to cities whose industrial growth is not sufficient

to provide full employment; 2) the continued urbanization of rural people in the advanced capitalist countries, but at a constantly decreasing pace as the populations of these countries are already largely urbanized; 3) inter-urban and inter-regional migration between and within the industrialized countries, and; 4) immigration of people from under-developed to developed capitalist countries, and primarily to the urban industrial centres. In other words, the Third World as well as the less developed capitalist countries in Southern Europe (Spain, Italy, Portugal, Greece), have come to form industrial reserve armies of labour, at the ready of the manpower requirements of the advanced capitalist countries (Castles and Kosack, 1973: 377; Ward, 1975: 18)[1].

Again, however, the importation of labour-power serves other purposes than simply catering to manpower needs. Despite the differences between contemporary capitalism and the early industrial capitalism of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, the main mechanisms of raising the rate of relative surplus value are by intensifying work and by depressing wages. In order to accomplish these ends the organizations of the working class must be relatively weak, and the working class itself fragmented. As we shall see, the massive importation of labour tends to fulfill both of these prerequisites, and thereby acts as a brake on rising wages. Indeed, labour

---

[1] In 1975 there were over eleven million immigrant workers in the countries of North-western Europe, (Ward, 1975: 17).

importation is used as a deterrent to crisis in the cycles of capital accumulation in the advanced capitalist countries (Castells, 1975: 45-6, 55-6; Gorz, 1970: 31; Mandell, 1975: 154; Paine, 1974: 12-15).

The first way in which the capitalist class accrues surplus profits through labour importation is by not having paid for the reproduction of that labour power. While most immigrants are young and productive, all of the social infrastructure costs involved in their early growth and training are borne by the countries from which they emmigrate (Gorz, 1970: 29). Restrictions on the immigration of the sick and infirm ensures that social costs to the country of destination will be minimized (Berger, 1975: 138).

Apart from the import of skilled labour to fill specific job categories, the majority of immigrants work in unskilled and semi-skilled positions. Immigrants tend to be concentrated in those sectors of industry which have the lowest pay or the worst working conditions (Castels and Kosack, 1975: 112). They are thus subject to the most intense forms of work and long working days (Castells, 1975: 49). Their physical isolation as the lowest stratum of the work force, together with their general lack of trade union experience, makes trade union work among immigrants difficult (Worsley, 1976: 135). In addition, their status as immigrants rather than citizens makes them politically and legally vulnerable. Any political or trade union involvement on the part of immigrants can be met with harrassment and intimidation by employers or govern-

ment (Castells, 1975: 52; Ward, 1975: 25).

The end result of these specific conditions of immigrant labour enables those sectors of industry in which immigrants are concentrated to increase production without facing a commensurate rise in wages.

If the concentration of immigrant workers in certain industrial sectors tends to produce surplus profits in those sectors, the overall size of the immigrant section of the work force is a major factor in weakening the working class as a whole, and thereby raising the general rate of surplus value. Immigrant workers are set off from the rest of the working class not only by isolation in the actual production process, but also by their status as foreigners. The cultural, racial and language differences between immigrants and the indigenous workers tends to consolidate immigrants' isolation and is even a source of antagonism between the two groups (Worsley, 1976: 134-6). In their daily experience indigenous workers do not necessarily see immigrants as sharing the same class interests: they see them as foreigners who are inherently different and who seem to accept the most menial jobs while at the same time competing with them for their jobs (Berger, 1975: 139). The presence of large numbers of immigrant workers creates the conditions whereby indigenous workers can be led to believe that the causes of their problems and of social problems do not lie in the social division of labour of capitalism, but in the presence of foreigners competing for their jobs. Thus, the working class turns against itself, becoming socially

fragmented and ideologically confused, and the employers are able to extract a higher surplus-value by intensifying work and depressing wages (Castells, 1975: 52, 59; Mandel, 1975: 169-70).

While importation of labour has been a fundamental prerequisite for the economic growth of the advanced capitalist countries, it has aggravated international inequalities:

> Underdevelopment is a pre-condition for the continued and expanded reproduction of a relative surplus population in the urban and rural areas of labour-supplying countries and is a condition deepened by the migration process (Carney, 1977: 36).

Cities of underdeveloped countries contain industrial development, but not at a scale sufficient to provide full employment for the urban population and for those driven off the land by the capitalist penetration of agriculture. Moreover, the urban economic infrastructure in these countries tends to be very uneven because the greatest proportion of capital is not reinvested locally, but is transferred to the parent firms in the developed capitalist countries. The cities of the underdeveloped world, therefore, house large reserves of labour and industrial working classes that are paid low wages in comparison to workers in the advanced countries. A logical result of such conditions is that those who are able to emmigrate to areas where their standard of living will be more secure, will do so. Those who meet the immigration requirements of the advanced countries are generally the ones with relatively high levels of education and vocational training

or experience. Therefore, a section of the most productive workers, and those workers on whom large amounts of social capital have been spent, are continuously leaving.

The export of labour thus represents a drain on the manpower force and social capital of the underdeveloped countries, and causes a deterioration in the age structure and productivity of the labour force that remains (Paine, 1974: 39). There is not yet any indication that the export of labour has led to a decline in the relative surplus population of the underdeveloped countries. Indeed, the firms of the advanced capitalist countries derive a dual benefit from the continued reproduction of a relative surplus population in the underdeveloped countries: they can exploit the cheap labour in the latter areas, and they can import labour into the industrial cities of the advanced countries; either way, they stand to gain surplus profits.

Conclusion

Urban social theory has generally assumed that the city is a distinct social form and an independent variable in the shaping of social life. Consequently, urban-rural relations are generally studied as if they are relations between the country and the city as two abstract entities. Alternately, urban-rural relations are studied at the empirical level of individual actors or small groups. In a similar vein urban social relations are studied almost exclusively in terms of behavioural patterns or forms of identity.

In contradistinction to the dominant modes of urban analysis, we have attempted to examine the urban question within the broader framework of the social division of labour. Originally, cities were the products of the process of the formation of social classes. One group removed itself from the generally reciprocal social relations of primitive society and began appropriating the social surplus product of the direct producers. The city was the physical manifestation of the separation of society into classes and the appropriation and concentration of surplus by the ruling classes.

Throughout the historical development of the social division of labour, the city has not been independent of the country. In the slave and feudal modes of production, agriculture constituted the dominant sphere of production. As long as this was the case the primary social relations of production were agrarian-based, and urban classes or class fractions, while interfering with agrarian social relations in order to extract larger surpluses, had no interest in fundamentally altering the basic social structure.

Although commodity production and the expansion of trade in the towns of feudal Europe fostered capital accumulation and concentration of the means of production, processes which laid the basis for the formation of the capitalist division of labour, capitalism proper took root in the rural villages. Thus, the town itself was not responsible for the emergence of the capitalist mode of production. Rather, the form of the modern city developed in conjunction with the

various phases of the capitalist division of labour. In particular, the concentration and expansion of the means of production and labour during the Industrial Revolution transformed the manufacturing town into the modern industrial city.

The fact that capitalism "concentrates the historical motive force of society" in the city does not mean that the city itself begins to determine urban social life or urban-rural relations. The on-going accumulation of capital both requires and results in greater concentrations of labour and means of production as well as the capitalist penetration of all spheres of production. The reproduction of the urban labour force is not usually sufficient to meet the manpower and economic requirements of industrial production, so capital draws on the relative surplus population of other areas. As the capitalist mode of production develops and the size of the surplus population diminishes in one area, other regions come to serve as sources of labour-power, not only for local production, but, through immigration, for the advanced industrial countries. Contemporary urbanization is thus rooted in the capitalist division of labour. The international character of urbanization processes, with a constant stream of peasants migrating into Third World cities, concurrent with a more or less constant stream of Third World urban working people to the industrial cities of the developed capitalist world, together with the on-going processes of urbanization within the latter countries, is a product of the uneven development of the internationalization of the capitalist mode of production.

CHAPTER FOUR

KOREAN IMMIGRATION AND THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

1. Introduction

In Chapter Two we reviewed the development of urban anthropology and concluded that theoretical and methodological devices carried over from urban sociology and cultural anthropology set limits on the explanatory power of the new discipline. The culture concept as applied in urban anthropology stipulates that the city and the country are distinct cultural entities and that urban social relations are conditioned primarily by urban culture. Chapter Three presented an alternative theoretical framework. Here the city was viewed in light of its role within the social division of labour. Urban social structures and relations were seen to derive eventually from historically determined modes of production and corresponding relations of production. The latter part of Chapter Three focussed on the city within the capitalist mode of production as a site for the production of surplus value and as a mediator in the reproduction of capitalist social relations. It was concluded that the immigration of people into the city is one of the mechanisms whereby the reproduction of the labour force is guaranteed, in ways conducive to the accumulation of capital.

To determine the validity of the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter Three it is necessary to apply the analysis

to a specific case — the Korean immigrant population in Edmonton, Alberta. As outlined below the Korean population in Edmonton can be described with the traditional urban anthropological referents of kinship, social networks and ethnicity. It is argued, however, that this type of analysis leaves unexplained the central issues impinging on Korean immigration and immigrants. Specifically, the standard anthropological analysis does not explain why Koreans emigrate in the first place, nor does it explain why the Korean community is articulated with the larger urban social structure in the particular way it is. Failing in these two areas, the traditional model finally cannot comprehensively analyze even its primary concern: the internal structure of the community. Following a brief survey of the Korean community in Edmonton the remainder of the chapter attempts to explain the first two issues, Korean emigration and the position of immigrants in the social division of labour in Edmonton. The concluding chapter addresses the issue of the internal structure of the Korean community within the framework of the division of labour. The incorporation of the Korean labouring classes into the international division of labour as a cheap labour force and a reserve army of labour is at the root of Korean migration. This initial subordination to capital, combined with the particular concentration and segmentation of Korean immigrants in the production process in Edmonton are the primary in-

fluences on the structure of the Korean immigrant community and its situation within the larger urban formation.

2. The Korean Immigrant Population as an Urban Ethnic Community

Approximately five-hundred and fifty Koreans were living in Edmonton at the time fieldwork began in May, 1975. Throughout the four months during which fieldwork was conducted this number was constantly augmented by the weekly arrival of one or two families or independent immigrants. There were roughly one-hundred and ten families. Thirty to forty percent of these had one or two preschool children or children who were already attending elementary school. Most of the thirty-five adolescents were in high school, but a few attended university. There were twenty-five grandmothers and ten grandfathers. With very few exceptions grandparents lived with their grown children. Men and women between the ages of twenty and forty comprised nearly four-fifths of the population. Nearly all women over twenty years of age were married. Most men over twenty-five were married, although some were temporarily living alone, having emigrated prior to their wives.

It is evident from the brief demographic survey presented above that kinship was an important integrative mechanism in the Korean community. Most immigrants had a network of kinship relations. Primary associations were often with immediate relatives. Several of the house-holds were comprised of three generations. Apart from being an

immediate focus of everday activities in Edmonton, kinship mediated the immigration process in two ways. First, many of the people interviewed said that they came to Canada in order to provide a better way of life and a higher standard of living for their family. Second, many people were able to come to Canada by being sponsored by relatives already living here. Thus, kinship was definitely important in both the formation of the Korean community in Edmonton and as a locus of on-going, day-to-day activities.

Other more informal associations were also important in structuring daily life. Friendship circles among Korean immigrants were generally small, composed of a few people who either knew each other in Korea or who met at work or at church in Edmonton. Very often friendship grew out of common interests. Ten men golfed together regularly in the summer, and a few families went fishing together a few times a year. There was also an informal organization which grouped together nearly all of the grandmothers. Twice a month they would gather at the house of one of the grown children (this was on a rotating basis) where they would party, eat, sing and dance.

In addition to kinship, friendship and common-interest associations there were three formal institutions which sought to establish links across the entire Korean community: a social club or community organization and two churches. The community organization started in 1965 simply as a series of social gatherings of the six to ten Korean

families that lived in Edmonton at the time. As the Korean population grew there was a recognized need to coordinate community-wide events and communications between the Korean population and the provincial government. The organization gradually became more formalized and instituted an executive which was elected annually. However, it had little influence on the daily life of immigrants. The dominant focus of the organization was to sponsor one or two picnics every summer and a dinner and social evening every New Year's Eve.

The two Korean churches were somewhat more active than was the community association. The first church, which Koreans referred to simply as Number One Church, was started in 1970 by a Protestant minister who moved to Edmonton from Vancouver. Up to one-hundred people attended Sunday services, which were held in an accommodating Canadian church. After service young people played volleyball in the church basement and older people visited and read Korean newspapers. Many of the people interviewed who attended Number One Church said that they had not been practicing Christians in Korea. They started going to church in Edmonton in order to meet and socialize with other Koreans.

Number Two Church was started during the winter of 1974-75 by a small group of devout Christians who were unhappy with the way the minister of Number One Church ran church affairs. This group believed that the church was too frivolously involved in social activities. They confronted the minister with their criticisms and demands but were unsuccessful, whereupon they began holding their own private

services in one man's home. After a few months they approached the minister of a Protestant Evangelical church in Edmonton who was sympathetic to their cause and offered to let them use his church. At the time of the research project Number Two Church was in the process of bringing over a conservative minister from Korea. In the meantime a group of elders were managing church affairs. Approximately fifty people attended service regularly.

On the basis of the evidence presented it might be concluded that the Korean community in Edmonton could best be described as an urban ethnic group. Most informal as well as formal association in which individuals were involved were with other Koreans and very often, in their associations with non-Korean individuals or institutions, they defined themselves as being Korean. In addition a common language definitely bound Korean immigrants together and set them apart socially from native Canadians and other immigrants. Nevertheless, whether we regard ethnicity as a set of identity markers or as a behavioral boundary, the concept fails to do justice to the complexities of the Korean community. Over the course of the fieldwork period none of my informants identified themselves primarily on the basis of some subjectively held notion of the "Koreanness", nor were there significant markers defining behavior as Korean or non-Korean.[1]

---

[1]This is not to say that there were not any pressures to maintain a degree of homogeneity of the community. A few single young men had plans to return temporarily to Korea in

Indeed, given the force of Korean nationalism in the twentieth century, it is surprising that ethnic consciousness and organization is as inefficacious as it is in the Korean community. The community organization was relatively inactive and in any event did little to sponsor social organization within the community. Very few informants expressed a determination to raise their children as Koreans. Parents often stated that they were Canadians now and that their children would grow up with less difficulty if they were fully socialized into Canadian life.[2] Even though a few informants expressed a desire to return to Korea upon retirement, such vague future plans had little influence on how people organized their lives in the present. Older people, particularly grandmothers, continued to attempt to identify with and behave according to socio-cultural criteria with which they had always lived. But this group was a special case: very few of them spoke English or had any substantial social interaction with non-Koreans.

It could be argued that ethnicity as a set of iden-

---

order to get married. They said that there was a certain amount of pressure on them to marry Koreans rather than Canadians. However, such rules are flexible and conditional rather than primary determinants of behavior. A young man who had grown up in Edmonton was able to marry a Canadian woman without any significant pressures to the contrary.

[2]Several parents stated, however, that they wanted their children to have more respect and be better behaved than Canadian Children.

tity or behavioral markers was weak among Korean immigrants because of the small size of the community and its relatively recent origin. However, these are the very reasons ethnicists use to argue the strength of ethnicity among other immigrant groups. Ethnicity and other sociocultural and behavioural variables do not explain why Koreans immigrated to Edmonton or the situation of the majority of Korean immigrants as unskilled or semi-skilled labourers. Clearly, we must be prepared to look at extra-sociocultural variables to analyze the segmented structure of the Korean community and its articulation within the larger social structure. Most Korean immigrants out of necessity must structure their lives around the production process and the division of labour within which they are situated. Differential location in the division of labour tends to be the primary source of conflict and social distance between Korean immigrants. Yet it must not be overlooked that Koreans were incorporated into a particular division of labour in Korea, and this prior situation, far from being independent of the present day reality of the Korean community in Edmonton, gave rise to immigration in the first place and continues to condition the lives of individual immigrants and the structure of the community. The fact that most Korean immigrants are between twenty and forty years of age and are therefore in the prime of their productive capacities is not something to be accepted as given: it is representative both of a crisis in the reproduction of the South Korean social formation and of the par-

ticular requirements of Canadian capital. Therefore, before proceeding with an analysis of the influence of the production process and class structure on the Korean immigrant community, a brief analysis of the class structure and political economy of South Korea is in order.

3. Historical Determinants of Korean Immigration

Korea's incorporation into the capitalist world economy has sponsored a tremendous qualitative and quantitative leap in the country's productive forces. Industrialization and industrial output has proceeded apace, particularly in the last two decades. However, economic development has occured primarily to serve the interests of capital accumulation by capitalists outside Korea in Japan, United States, West Germany and elsewhere. Modern South Korea might properly - if somewhat simplistically, be said to be the product of the uneven development of capitalism. It is this uneven development and the ongoing reconstruction of a reserve army of labour and a cheap labour force which continues to attract foreign capital to Korea while at the same time repelling Korean workers from their homeland.

To stress the importance of Korea's incorporation into the capitalist world system is not to deny the historical specificity of Korea. The articulation over time of the Korean class structure within the international social division of labour is the source of Korea's uneven development and patterns of labour migration. In the late 1860's

and early 1870's, when China was suffering increasingly intense imperialist penetration and Japan was undergoing a rapid independent transition to a capitalist mode of production, Korea remained relatively backward and isolated. Korea had a centuries-old semi-feudal form of social structure. Royal dynasties theoretically held property rights over all land, but nobility and a class fraction of officials had gradually acquired hereditary property rights at the local level (Brun and Hersh, 1976: 27). The greatest proportion of the population was the peasantry, on whose labour and agricultural surplus the dynasty, nobility and officials depended. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries this semi-feudal social formation was undergoing a period of internal weakness and decline, comcommitant with the appearance and development of what could be described as an incipient capitalism: commercial capital was emerging and becoming influential in some of the towns, a wage labour force was forming and the peasantry was undergoing internal differentiation (Brun and Hersh, 1976: 29). This was also a period of intense class conflict.

However, whatever transition Korea was undergoing was forcibly transformed by the impact of increasing imperialist penetration in the 1870's and 1880's. Several countries attempted to extract trading concessions from Korea, but Japan was able to out maneuver its rivals and establish hegemony over the process of Korean development. In 1876 Japan forced an unfavourable commercial treaty on the Korean

government. In 1894 and in 1904-1905 Japan militarily defeated China and Russia respectively, further increasing Japanese influence on Korea. Finally in 1910 Japan annexed Korea and imposed colonial rule over the country. Korea's colonial status lasted until 1945. This period of colonialism and the neo-colonialism which has followed in South Korea subjected Korean economic development to the interests of foreign capital and had great influence on the formation of the modern Korean class structure.

Japan's first interest in colonizing Korea was to ensure the production and appropriation of rice for Japanese markets. During Japan's rapid industrialization in the late nineteenth century agricultural production underwent a severe decline, in part because peasant agriculture subsidized urban industrial development and capital accumulation. By 1900 Japan was a net importer of rice, which negatively influenced its balance of trade. Colonialism guaranteed a cheap source of rice for Japan. However, the prevailing system of peasant production and semi-feudal property relations in Korea held back production and kept a large amount of surplus off the market. Therefore, after the Sino-Japanese War, Japanese finance capitalists and state administrators intervened in the rural social structure by converting the previously dominant system of payment of rent in kind or services to a system of money rent. After 1905 Japanese civil law was introduced to Korea, providing the legal sanction for the institutionalization of private land ownership in place of

previous land-holding practices (Brun and Hersch, 1976: 43; Suh, 1978: 9).

The restructuring of rural land tenure brought about changes in agrarian social structure. Traditional class positions and relations based on birth withered away and a new class of Korean capitalist landlords emerged whose primary interest was to increase peasant production (Suh, 1978: 9). The growth and potential power of this class was checked, however, by the immigration of Japanese landlord farmers and the appearance of Japanese land companies which bought or were granted large tracts of land. Quite clearly, Japanese colonial interests dictated against the emergence of an autonomous Korean landlord class which would possibly hinder the accumulation of capital and the appropriation of agricultural produce by Japanese capitalists.

Although the form of property relations changed during the first phase of Japanese colonialism and the accumulation of capital became the primary determinant in the structure of property relations, this accumulation depended upon the peasants who were still the primary producers. There is overwhelming evidence to indicate that the condition of the peasantry worsened substantially between 1905 and 1945 (Brun and Hersh, 1978; Kuznets, 1977; Suh, 1978). In the first place, they were stripped of their rights over land and labour, so the amount of produce they were able to retain and their control over the production process itself decreased absolutely. In the second place, the Japanese

colonial administration discouraged agricultural diversification in order to bolster rice production. Thirdly, the import of mass produced Japanese consumer goods gradually ruined rural cottage industry. Thus the capacity of the peasantry to reproduce themselves socially and physically degenerated as rural capitalist property relations redefined peasant producers as rural wage labourers or tenant farmers.

While altering rural property relations and fundamentally changing agrarian class structure, Japanese colonial policy initially curtailed similarly far reaching changes in urban social structure. Large industrial capitalists in Japan were opposed to industrial development in Korea because the cheapness of Korean labour would give industry based in Korea a competitive advantage over Japanese industry. Therefore industrial development in Korea was severely restricted, particularly by the enforcement of the Corporation Law of 1911 which discriminated against Korean enterprises (Suh, 1978: 10). One result of this policy was that the formation of a Korean bourgeoisie was limited from the outset. Another result was that the Korean peasantry were further impoverished. Stripped of their traditional ties to the land they were as yet unable to float from rural to urban labour, and without this escape valve the size of the rural labour force could be kept over-large and their wages depressed.

Following World War I, the existence of surplus capital in Japan and growing nationalist opposition in Korea converged to force a change in Japanese colonial policy. In

1920 the Corporation Law was rescinded and trade tariffs between Japan and Korea were abolished. Nevertheless, until 1930, investment was largely restricted to small scale extractive or processing activities and the emphasis of colonial policy continued to be directed toward the expansion of rice production. After 1931 Japanese military and finance capital interests encouraged massive investment in mining and heavy industry and the expansion of rice production was curtailed so as to avoid further deterioration of the agricultural sector in Japan (Suh, 1978: 13).

The source of labour for industrialization in the 1930's was the Korean countryside, where the earlier changes in property relations had created a relative surplus population and a reserve army of labour out of the ranks of the peasant producers. Nevertheless, rural labour was attracted to urban industry not by higher urban wage scales but were driven from the land by the steadily worsening conditions in the countryside (Suh, 1978: 149). In fact urban industrial working conditions were abominable. The average work day in small and medium sized plants was twelve hours. A large proportion of the unskilled labour force were women and children working in primitive and unsanitary conditions for wages which were below the subsistence level (Brun and Hersh, 1976: 59). Higher paying skilled jobs tended to be monopolized by Japanese immigrants. Limited opportunities and poor working conditions led to large-scale emigration of wage labourers from Korea in the 1930's, for the most part to Japan

or to other Japanese colonies, where they continued to serve as a cheap labour supply (Kuznets, 1977: 89; Suh, 1978: 114).

In brief, Japanese colonialism left Korea with a highly unbalanced, externally depended economic and political structure. The Korean capitalist class, whether urban - or rural - based was small and weak. The industrial proletariat was segmented by age, sex, sector and region. Such intense segmentation, together with the political and economic constraints and dictates of Japanese colonial policy and the continuous influx of rural labour and out-migration of a part of the work force disrupted and prevented effective forms of working class organization. The countryside as well as the towns came to serve as industrial reserve armies of labour. Capitalization of rural property and social relations reduced and restructured the peasantry's access to the means of production. Relative surplus population and stringent legal controls which safeguarded the interests of the landlords and land companies perpetuated low rural wages. With their access to and control over the means of production reduced, peasants, tenant farmers and landless wage labourers could be brought into urban industry as required. The large reserve army of labour in the countryside and the masses of under-employed or unemployed urban labourers ensured low industrial wage rates. Finally, the industrial proletariat itself served as a source of cheap labour for Japanese capital not only in Korea but in Japan and other Japanese colonies as well. By 1945 there were 2.4 million Koreans in Japan,

alone (Bix, 1973: 185).

Although World War II and the Korean civil war wrought further severe changes on the Korean social formation, in particular, effectively dividing the country into two autonomous regions, it was the pattern of uneven development and the class structure formed under Japanese colonialism that has been of primary influence on the subsequent development of South Korea.[3] During Syngman Rhee's dictatorship neither the nascent Korean bourgeoisie nor American and Japanese capital were able to effectively exploit the situation which a large reserve army of labour offered them in Korea.[4] The brief period of relative freedom after Syngman Rhee's ouster in 1961 was followed by the seizure of state power by Park Chung Hee and a small group of military officers. His dictatorship was and is designed to safeguard the interests of an historically weak national bourgeoisie and the operations of international capital in Korea (Bix, 1973: 206).

---

[3]This is a simplified and schematic presentation of the modern history of Korea. In particular it minimizes the fundamental political roles of the United States and Japan. However, this theme has been covered adequately elsewhere (Baldwin, 1973). Our purpose is to analyze contemporary Korean migration in light of the background of class structure and uneven development which are the preconditions for such migration.

[4]The limited maneuverability of capital was not due to any sympathy for labour by Syngman Rhee but his hostility to Japan and his generally autocratic policies.

The basis of economic development in post-World War II, South Korea has been the on-going reconstruction of the industrial reserve. As such the state has been heavily involved in planning and managing economic development:

> ...the Korean economy depends in large measure on private enterprise operating under highly centralized government guidance. In Korea the government role is considerably more direct than that of merely setting the broad rules of the game and influencing the economy through market forces (Hasan, 1976: 29).

Given the weakness of the bourgeoisie, the large reserves of labour and the external orientation of the economy, Korean economic policy is intended to integrate South Korea into the capitalist international division of labour as a producer of inexpensive export manufactures. In order to accomplish this integration the state's programme is pinned on two basic principles: 1) encouraging foreign investment, and; 2) maintaining an abundant supply of cheap labour. The state has intervened extensively in the economy in both economic and extra-economic ways to effect these two principles.

To encourage foreign investment and trade, one of the Park regime's most important operations was to normalize diplomatic relations with Japan. Although American multi-national corporations had been active in Korea since the 1950's, "the export-platform, labour-intensive development model of South Korea in a sense 'took-off' in 1965", which was when the Normalization Treaty was enacted (Long, 1977: 33). Japanese direct investment increased from $1.2 million in

1965 to $27.1 million in 1969, and was concentrated predominantly in the labour-intensive export sector:

> By March 1970, Japanese companies had acquired control of about 90 percent of South Korea's fertilizer industry, 64 percent of its chemical industry, 62 percent of foodstuffs, 48 percent of glassmaking and cement and 43.5 percent of its chemical industry (Bix, 1973: 215)

In addition to normalizing relations and thereby opening Korea to Japanese investment joint economic planning units were established to encourage such investment, direct it toward specific sectors and supply political safeguards and protection (Bix, 1973: 215). Even Korea's own planning agencies had a high presence of foreign economists, and the World Bank in particular has been active in supplying studies to the state and making them available for active or potential foreign investors. Finally, investors are attracted by such enticements as "free export zones" where foreign-owned factories can export their products tax-free (Bix, 1973: 216), as well as low taxes and free or low-cost infractural provisions.

The Korean state, in collaboration with the bourgeoisie of the Korean Businessmen's Association, foreign capital and various international economic and political organizations has certainly been successful in implementing and promoting its export oriented economic policy. Approximately half of the gross manufacturing output is comprised of food, beverages, and tobacco, and; textiles, clothes, and leather (Hasan, 1976: 67). These are the very manufactures, along with electronics, in which foreign capital is concentrated. A

few labour-intensive products account for 60% of total manufactured exports (Hasan, 1976: 5; Long, 1977: 30). Labour-intensive export industry is the most dynamic sector of the South Korean economy.

Probably overriding all of the reasons so far discussed why foreign capital has so intensively penetrated the south Korean social formation is the abundant, cheap labour force. In 1960 Korea had one of the lowest income levels in the world (Hasan, 1976: 28). Today, the average Korean worker earns one-tenth what American workers earn and one-sixth what Japanese workers earn. However, the provision and reproduction of a cheap labour force is not a natural phenomenon. Even conventional economists acknowledge that the South Korean state systematically intervenes economically and politically to ensure the existence of cheap labour to be exploited at will by capital:

> ...government labour and agricultural policies have discriminated against peasants and industrial workers, two major occupational groups at the bottom of the income-size distribution (Kuznets, 1977: 106).

> Thus the Korean labour force offered a favorable resource for achieving rapid growth. It was characterized by almost total literacy, relatively high levels of education, industriousness, and relatively low wage rates in terms of either domestic or international prices. Also, there was a large number of unemployed and under-employed workers who could be drawn into new or more productive employment as the opportunities and demands arose (Cole and Lyman; 1971: 139).

Maintaining and even swelling the ranks of the industrial reserve army is one of the most important methods by which the state guarantees the conditions of cheap labour. The reserve army was already in place at the end of World War II, the product of Japanese colonialism. The later repatriation of hundreds of thousands of Koreans from Japan and other former colonies of Japan further extended the size of the reserve labour force. Nevertheless, the Korean countryside continues to serve as the major source of the reserve army, just as it did during the colonial era. By depressing the agricultural sector the Park regime has forced millions of peasants and rural wage labourers to migrate to the urban industrialized areas. In the 1960's the government enforced a policy of artificially lowering prices for agricultural products (Kuznets, 1977: 107). Prices for rice were further reduced by shipments of low-cost or gratis rice from the United States. For rural labourers the consequences of such policies were disastrous. The amount of land under cultivation shrank and rural unemployment increased. In 1974 the average wage of a rural worker was half that of an urban worker (Hasan, 1976: 54).

The predictable result of the depression in the South Korean agricultural sector is rural out-migration. Between 1966 and 1974 the rural population decreased from 54 percent of the total population to only 40 percent. Most migration is to Seoul and a few other urban centers where industry is concentrated. Seoul's population increased

from 2.5 million in 1960 to 6.8 million in 1975, and now accounts for fully 20 percent of South Korea's population (Hasan, 1976: 54; Long, 1977: 35). Urban industry therefore had easy access to a very large labour pool. However, by no means do all rural-urban migrants become employed once in the city. An economist writing for the World Bank states that real urban unemployment was 10 to 11 percent in 1972 (Hasan, 1976: 47). Other writers claim that in the same year one-quarter of potential workers were unemployed (Kuznets, 1977: 127; Long, 1977: 34). Regardless of the actual rate of unemployment, in its five-year plans the state has shown no evidence of attempting to reduce unemployment. Rather, we must assume that the directly or indirectly enforced rural-urban migration is designed to sustain the cheap industrial labour force. It accomplishes just this by swelling the existing urban industrial reserve army of labour and by exerting a downward pressure on industrial wages.

The state employs other mechanisms in addition to the reserve army of labour to maintain the conditions of cheap labour. It intervenes directly in the economy by enforcing wage restraints in almost all industrial sectors. Beyond this the state exerts continuous political pressure to weaken and control trade unions. State intervention in union affairs actually began in the late 1940's under the United States Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) and Syngman Rhee, when communist dominated trade unions were banned (Breidenstein, 1973: 255; Long, 1977: 37). Under the

Park regime not only have unions been severely restricted but they often have become arms of state control. All unions are required to be members of the government's Federation of Korean Trade Unions. Many union leaders are closely associated with the government and the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (Breidenstein, 1973: 255). In addition, in 1972, the government restricted the right to strike.

The cumulative effects of the continuing reproduction and enlargement of the industrial reserve army and of the governments repressive policies is that trade unions are unable to organize workers politically or improve their economic situation:

> There is little union tradition in Korea, and trade unions have been instruments of government labour control rather than organizations concerned with the economic welfare of their members. Membership is limited, there is no minimum wage law, and furthermore, an elaborate set of bargaining and standards acts inaugerated by the AMG in the 1940's has been largely ignored. This evidence of union weakness indicates, if only indirectly, that unions have had little effect on raising wage levels or limiting unemployment (Kuznets, 1977: 122).

Essentially, state repression and control of labour organizations is fundamental for the reproduction of the preconditions of cheap labour. Not only are the unions that exist not able to raise wage levels, they are unable to improve working conditions or abate the intensification of work. In general, throughout the 1970's, real wages have risen significantly less than labour productivity, a major

factor accounting for high corporate profits.

Social policy in South Korea is often related to the requirements of preserving cheap labour. Such is the case, to some extent, with education. Labour-intensive production does not abrogate the need for a skilled and educated labour force. In South Korea export production often combines labour-intensive and capital-intensive techniques. Some portion of the labour force must have the training to operate advanced technology and heavy machinery. In addition the state provides much of the infrastructural requirements of industry, and the construction and operation of communication and transportation networks requires educated and skilled labour. The education and training of the labour force began under the American military government (Kuznets, 1977: 33). Today South Korea has one of the higest educated and best trained labour forces in Asia. The education and training of workers can in no sense be thought of as neutral or primarily designed for their benefit, for in combination with the political and economic policies discussed above it makes workers more accessible to capital, and more exploitable:

> In addition to the underlying strength deriving from the educational system, the Korean labour force has other attributes that have enhanced its contribution to economic growth. Korean workers have been described by one manpower specialist as "adaptable, trainable, manually dextrous, and accustomed to arduous work for long hours" (Cole and Lyman, 1971: 138).

All in all, the Korean state's economic, political and social policies are designed to integrate South Korea into the capitalist international division of labour as producer of labour-intensive manufactures for export. This integration is accomplished, among other ways, by the two-pronged strategy we have examined— encouraging foreign investment and reproducing an abundant cheap labour force. It has been a violent integration. The policies and processes of uneven development have caused severe social dislocation for the peasantry and the working class: agricultural stagnation, migration, regional inequalities, low wages, poor working conditions, housing shortages, political repression. Even sections of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie have suffered decline under the powerful forces of concentration and centralization of capital.

One particular result and reinforcement of Korea's uneven development is that, given the fact that the accumulation of capital in large measure circulates outside the country or is over-concentrated and removed from the general circuits of internal circulation, the state has been forced to borrow heavily on the international money markets to finance economic growth and the constantly inflating political and military structures.[5] The export of workers is one way

---

[5]This heavy borrowing and consequent indebtedness is one reason why conventional economists have shown such an intense interest in South Korea in the last few years; the other major reason is the condition of the country as a prime source of surplus profits.

by which the state has been able to reduce its international debt service burden: intergovernmental labour movement agreements and remittances sent back to Korea from workers abroad brings in foreign currency. The importance of foreign currency earnings through the export of labour should not be underestimated: In the contemporary period the export of labour force began when miners and nurses were sent to West Germany as part of Park's initial stabilization of the economy after he seized power (Bix, 1973: 207). Since that time the periodic export of labour has been used to ease deficits; it has been particularly pronounced in the 1970's as a report on South Korea's economic performance in 1977 reveals:

> The rise in overseas construction work (contracts rose from US $2.5 billion in 1976 to US $3.5 billion last year) pulled skilled labour out of Korea with "real" wages about three times the domestic level. What is more, the unexpectedly high flow of foreign currency earnings from abroad added more cash to domestic money supply than anticipated. In fact, economists were counting on US $ 2 billion worth of invisible receipts: instead, remittances from overseas projects pushed the total to US $3 billion. The resulting increase in net foreign assets of US 1.3 billion was equivalent to the entire rise in money supply for the year. As such, the foreign sector is seen as the chief culprit for a rekindling of inflation — South Korea's worst economic problem in 1978 (Ramsey, 1978: 43).

Labour migration is not convenient solely for the Korean state (within the constraints of its own manpower requirements and the high rate of inflation), for it is particularly convenient to capital in the advanced capitalist countries. Labour migration provides for the reproduction

of the labour force under conditions conducive to the accumulation of capital. A case in point involves Taihei Denyo Kaisha, a large Japanese power-generating and petrochemical corporation which is engaged in some major projects in the Middle East (Dahlby, 1976: 114). Facing a shortage of skilled labour in the Middle East and in Japan, the company has pioneered the recruitment and training of Korean and other East Asian labour for its international enterprises. Taihei Denyo has a labour subcontracting firm in Seoul, and the workers it recruits are trained at a South Korean government training school. Thus the cost of training Korean workers for use by a Japanese firm in its international operations is subsidized by the Korean state. There are two additional sources of savings for the company. First, to acquire enough Japanese labour for its projects, it would have to substantially increase wage levels. Second, it is likely that the Korean workers are paid less than their Japanese counterparts (Dahlby, 1976: 114).

This example serves to illustrate the point made at the beginning of the chapter — that the incorporation of Korea into the international division of labour as a source of cheap labour power is at the root of contemporary Korean migration. The subordination of Korean labouring classes as a reserve army of labour and a cheap labour force for foreign capital operating in Korea makes Korean labour available to capitalist enterprise outside Korea. This initial subordination to national and international capital,

together with the depressed living standards that result from the uneven development of Korea and the suppression of civil liberties which is required in order to maintain such uneven development and depressed living standards, condition and stimulate Korean migration on an international scale.

4. Korean Immigration and the Division of Labour In Edmonton

The capitalist division of labour in its international and local manifestations is of fundamental importance to the formation of the Korean community in Edmonton. Korea's incorporation into the international division of labour as a source of cheap labour power gives rise to Korean migration. The particular set of requirements of capitalist production in Edmonton tends to concentrate Korean immigrants in particular industrial sectors. This concentration tends to isolate Korean workers from Canadian and other immigrants and thus acts as a stimulus to community formation. However, in addition to being concentrated in particular industrial sectors, Korean workers are divided and isolated from each other in the production process, and this is a strong source of community fragmentation.

Korean Migration: Individual, Social Class and Institutional Framework. Our starting point in analyzing the immigrant community is the migration process itself. The social division of labour of the capitalist mode of

production and the situation of Korea within the capitalist system form the general conditions for the emergence and maintenance of Korean migration. To what extent is the division of labour instrumental in an individual's decision to emigrate? To what extent is the institutional framework of migration — Canadian immigration policy — conditioned by the division of labour? These are important questions, for if the division of labour is minimal in conditioning the actual immigration process, then the standard anthropological conceptions of urbanism and ethnicity might assume the credibility our previous discussion denied them. On the other hand, if the division of labour is a crucial element of the immigration process then we may assume that it is important in the subsequent formation of the Korean community.

Although the great majority of immigrants came from Seoul or its immediate environs there was substantial variation in the social background of Koreans living in Edmonton. Roughly half of the men and women between twenty-five and forty years of age who were interviewed had received either university education or technical training in Korea. A number of men had studied engineering or architecture. Still others had received degrees in the humanities or social sciences. None of the women had studied engineering or architecture. Several had studied music or literature, and still more had received degress in nursing. Many of the people who had secondary education emigrated either shortly after graduation or after working for a few years in their profession.

In addition to this basically middle class layer of immigrants there was a small number of petty bourgeois businessmen who had been owners of small retail shops or subcontracting firms. There were also a few men who had held managerial positions, one in a steel mill, another in a trucking firm and a third had managed a mink farm.

The great majority of the rest of the immigrants were from working class backgrounds. Even among this group, however, there was a high probability that some technical training or skill had been acquired. Several women had been keypunch operators or laboratory assistants. Perhaps twenty men were skilled miners. They had originally gone to Germany as part of an intergovernmental contract whereby large numbers of young men were given six weeks of language and technical training in Korea and then sent to Germany. Upon completing their three years' contract most miners chose not to return to Korea; and some wound up in Edmonton.

Variability in social class background tended to produce differences of stress in the reasons given for migration. Men from working class backgrounds were definitely more likely to state that they emigrated so as to find jobs with which they would be better able to support their families. Middle class and petty bourgeois immigrants more often complained about the lack of opportunities for individual advancement in Korea. Many such informants expressed bitterness that corruption and "connections" were required to get good jobs. Several of the university graduates said that they

emigrated because of the lack of suitable jobs in Korea.

Regardless of differences of stress in the reasons given for emigrating, two common themes ran through nearly all the reasons given for leaving Korea and coming to Canada. First, all of the informants of working age explicitly or implicitly assumed in their answers that they had one particular quality which, despite differences in skill and occupation was somehow being underfulfilled in Korea, but was attractive to Canadian immigration authorities: their labour power. Several informants cited cases of friends or acquaintences who had failed the immigration test because they did not have the skills which were desired by immigration officials at that particular time. Some informants took courses such as keypunch operating or welding which they believed would count for extra points on their applications. A few candidly stated that they had lied to immigration officials about their education or work history.

Second, most informants stated that they had applied to come to Edmonton or elsewhere in Alberta because they had heard that Alberta was a land of opportunity. They formed this opinion either through reading newspapers or receiving letters from friends and relatives in Alberta or elsewhere in Canada.

In other words most of the informants recognized subjectively and with differing degrees of consciousness that they possessed one commodity — their labour power — with which they fitted into the social division of labour in Korea

and in Canada. This does not deny the important role of social class in an individual immigrant's ability to emigrate and his or his perceptions of migration. It does attest to the fact that the social division of labour (and hence class structure) not only forms the broad backdrop to the migration process, it conditions fundamentally the engagement of the individual in the process. In essence, faced with a condition of closure within their own social formation, because of its uneven development and external orientation within the international social division of labour, those who are able to migrate to regions where they will be able to improve their living conditions, even if they are still subordinate to the forces of essentially the same division of labour will do so.

One half of the migration equation remainds undocumented: Canadian immigration policy. Without going into detail about the specificity of Canadian immigration policy, we can say that it neatly falls into the theoretical framework proposed in Chapter Three. The history of Canadian immigration policy is the history of the Canadian state's efforts to reproduce the labour force under conditions conducive to the accumulation of capital.[6] However, political and ideological factors play an important role in immigration policy. From

---

[6]An extensive economic analysis of Canadian immigration policy has been attempted elsewhere (Green, 1976). Here we are merely concerned to establish the broad outlines of immigration policy in order to show how it has affected Korean immigration.

1885 at least until the late 1950's the preferred source of immigration was Europe. Asian immigration was generally severely restricted and regulated under separate immigration acts or special clauses of existing acts. The 1910 Immigration Act clearly stipulates the racial and national criteria governing the selection of immigrants, excluding those:

> "...deemed undesirable because of climatic, industrial, social, educational, labour or other conditions or requirements of Canada, or deemed undesirable because of their customs, habits, modes of life and methods of holding property and, their probable ability to become readily assimilated" (quoted in Green, 1976: 14).

By the mid-1950's the combination of a tight domestic labour market, the diminishing size of the relative surplus population in the traditional labour supplying countries and competition from other labour importing countries led to adjustments in Canadian labour policy. First, the range of admissible classes of European immigrants was widened so that any applicant who had skills which were in demand in Canada and who could adapt to Canadian society was theoretically eligible for immigration (Green, 1976: 24). However, this expanded supply was still insufficient to meet Canada's manpower needs and in 1957 ethnic discrimination was (in theory if not always in practice) officially abandoned as a cornerstone of Canadian immigration policy and skill and educational level were given more importance (Green, 1976: 34-5).

Political and ideological criteria continue to play a role in immigration policy, as many Korean immigrants can testify. Several informants stated that they were subjected to humiliating questioning by immigration officers curious to know their political beliefs and whether or not they thought they could adjust to Canadian society. Nevertheless, Korean immigration is more or less determined by the particular manpower requirements in Canada at any given time. The first Koreans to arrive in Edmonton in the mid-1960's were professionals or highly trained technicians, many of whom had taken some of their education in the United States. This initial immigration flow appears to have coincided with the government's estimation of the requirements of the labour market at the time (Green, 1976: 35). In the 1970's however, the majority of Korean immigrants were being advised by immigration officers to seek semi-skilled or skilled manual labour jobs. Several male informants stated that immigration officers told them that steel workers and welders were in demand in Edmonton. A number of informants also stated that they became interested in immigrating to Edmonton after seeing advertisements placed in Korean newspapers by Edmonton steel fabricating firms seeking employees.

Canadian immigration policy under which Korean immigration to Edmonton is regulated, is strongly conditioned by the fluctuating dictates of the division of labour. Thus Korean immigrants are subjugated to the capitalist division of labour in Edmonton even before they emigrate from Korea. The first

benefit Canadian capital and the Canadian state derive from Korean immigration is that they have not had to pay any of the costs for the reproduction of that labour power embodied in the individual immigrants. Most of them arrive in Canada fully grown, in the prime of their productive capacities and with some degree of education and vocational training or experience. Their initial subordination to capital implies a continuing subordination after their arrival in Edmonton. In practice, of course, there are many intervening variables such as sponsorship of family members, different levels of skill and the often arbitrary decisions of immigration officers which complicate immigration patterns and hence the subsequent formation of the Korean community in Edmonton. The objective and subjective reasons behind Korean migration and the institutional framework within which immigration occurs set the immediate preconditions for the existence of a Korean population in Edmonton, their relationship to the division of labour and community formation. The crucial conditions for community formation is the location of Korean immigrants in the division of labour and the production process in Edmonton.

Sectoral and occupational concentration of Korean Immigrants. Despite the rapidly expanding rate of Korean immigration and the relatively small Korean population in Edmonton, Korean immigrants were linked to the division of labour in clearly visible patterns. The majority of adult

Koreans were unskilled, semi-skilled or skilled labourers who were concentrated in a few industrial sectors. There was, as stated above, a sizable minority of professionals working in a broad range of occupations. In the 1960's professionals constituted the majority of the population. The core group of these professionals, consisting of a few university professors, an architect and a dentist had, upon arriving in Edmonton, been able to establish themselves relatively quickly in occupations for which they had been trained in Korea or elsewhere. More recent members of the professional strata tended to be concentrated in engineering. The trend throughout the 1970's, however, was that this professional strata was diminishing both in its numerical significance compared to Koreans in manual labour and in the numbers of professionals arriving in Edmonton.

At the time of the study, there were a few small Korean owned business: one or two grocery stores, a martial arts studio and a restaurant. There were indications that this essentially petty bourgeois strata would continue to expand and since the time of the study, a few more restaurants have opened. However, the number of Koreans engaged in such activities was relatively small. Most of these family businesses were economically marginal and were often subsidized by wages earned at other jobs.

Some of the male manual workers were employed by construction companies that had projects in and around Edmonton. The greatest proportion, however, worked at steel fabricating

plants. The largest plant employed more than twenty Koreans. A small operation employed up to fifteen and a smaller one still employed seven Koreans out of a total workforce of twenty-one. The greatest proportion of women worked in a large garment factory; eighteen Korean women were observed on one shift alone. In addition, a significant number of women worked in nursing homes or auxiliary hospitals.

Many of the men and women working in the steel mills or in the garment factory or nursing homes had had training and experience in Korea that equipped them for work in these sectors. Others did not have suitable training but were advised by immigration officers to seek jobs in these sectors. Still others had come to Edmonton in search of better jobs after having first immigrated to Ontario, or elsewhere. However, there appears to have been a very limited range of choice for most immigrants. Even if they had been highly educated in Korea, upon arriving in Edmonton they generally had to find jobs which did not require a proficient knowledge of English, or Canadian experience. This usually meant taking jobs in sectors for which they were neither necessarily trained nor in which they desired to be employed. Even if they had had appropriate training, they started in the lowest unskilled categories. If they had not been told by immigration officers in Korea to look for work in such industries as steel fabricating, it was more than likely that, upon arrival in Edmonton, Korean relatives, friends, or acquaintances informed them of job opportunities

at one of the steel mills or in the garment factory.

Many of the men working in the steel mills and women working in the garment factory or nursing homes considered their jobs to be temporary. Informants often expressed the view that after they had settled themselves in Edmonton, learned English and acquired some Canadian job experience, they would search for jobs which were more suitable to them or they would take courses to upgrade their skills. However, the general experience of these workers reveals that it was much more difficult actually to realize such job and occupational mobility. The conditions in which they worked did not help them to become fluent in English, or to gain experience that could serve as a basis for occupational mobility. In addition, a number of informants stated that they encountered discrimination when attempting to get better jobs.

In the steel mill which employed the greatest number of Koreans, the hours were long, generally ten hours a day, six days a week. When a worker finished work, he would generally be too exhausted even to attempt to study English. In any case, shift-work prevented most people from enrolling in a language course. In all of the steel plants, moreover, the pace and intensity of work prohibited communication except when necessary. The social organization of work also minimized communication in English. In the largest plant most Koreans were concentrated in one shop. They spoke Korean among themselves and had very little need

to speak English. In the smaller plants Korean workers were also grouped together. In the medium-sized plant one of the foremen was Korean, and he acted as interpreter between management and the Korean workers. In addition to the disadvantage of being grouped together in shops or work teams, many of the other workers were immigrants who were not fluent in English. Finally, informants reported many cases of Canadian workers insulting them for their awkward use of English, thus humiliating them and making them reluctant to speak the language, even when they had the opportunity.

Likewise, the conditions of work made it difficult for women to learn English. Most women working in the garment factory or in nursing homes or auxiliary hospitals did shift work. Most of them were married and had children, and when not working they were generally taking care of the family. In the garment factory most workers were grouped along ethnic lines and few informants stated that inter-ethnic competition was tacitly encouraged by supervisors. The social organization of piece-work was much less demanding of cooperation than was production in the steel fabricating plants, and this further impeded immigrants in learning English. The social organization of labour in the nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals also limited the chances for immigrant workers to learn English. Each nursing assistant or aide was assigned to a particular ward or floor and had little opportunity to speak with other workers. Most of the patients were old or invalid and seldom spoke.

Despite the generally prohibitive conditions for learning English, many immigrants were able, over the course of a year or two, to become proficient in the language. At this point many of them realized that the education or vocational training they may have received in Korea and their limited experience working in the steel mills or the garment factory did not guarantee their being able to move up to a higher job category or change occupations. Several male informants who had received draftsmen's diplomas or welder's tickets in Korea were turned down from such jobs in Edmonton ostensibly because they did not have Canadian experience or were trained in inapplicable techniques. Several women who had been keypunch operators in Korea were also told by prospective employers in Edmonton that they needed Canadian experience and training. Women who had received nursing diplomas in Korea and were currently working as nursing aides were told by their superiors that they would have to take courses for several months and write an examination before they could be registered in Alberta.

Several immigrants, male and female, who had acquired proficiency in English after being in Edmonton for one or two years had left their jobs to obtain technical training at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (N.A.I.T.). Most men went in for welding, and most women took courses in keypunch operating. Many of these people, however, later found that they were unable to become employed in the type of work N.A.I.T. had trained them for. Women in particular

had bitter experiences trying to place themselves in their desired occupations. One woman, who had studied keypunch operating in Korea and Edmonton was turned down by ten potential employers, many of whom told her that she had to have three years previous experience as a keypunch operator in Canada. She ended up working once more at the garment factory, bitter and disillusioned. Several female informants had similar experiences, and many claimed that the Department of Immigration and Manpower discouraged them from upgrading their skills and refused to assist them in their search for better jobs. Men who studied welding usually had better results than Korean women who had attended N.A.I.T. Even so, most of them returned to the steel fabricating plants to work, only now as skilled rather than as unskilled or semi-skilled labourers.

Despite the lack of data on wage rates and profits, the employment patterns of the majority of Korean immigrants clearly indicate that capital is able to increase the rate of relative surplus value by their employment. When Korean immigrants arrive in Edmonton they are either already destined to work in one of a limited range of sectors or they quickly realize that these are practically the only sectors initially available for them to work in. Given the large proportion of immigrants in steel fabricating, garment manufacturing and nursing homes it is safe to assume that employers in these sectors are unable to find enough Canadian labourers to fill the positions. This is the case

not simply because of a quantitative lack of indigenous workers. Rather, the generally intense and dangerous working conditions (in the garment factory and steel mills), the long hours working shifts and the generally low pay (in the garment factory and the nursing homes) are unattractive to indigenous workers if they have the possibility to work elsewhere. Indigenous workers certainly have greater relative possibilities than do immigrants because they are proficient in English, they are more likely to have Canadian vocational training or work experience and they are less likely to face racial or national discrimination.

When Korean immigrants begin working in these sectors they almost invariably start in the unskilled and hence lowest paying categories. This is true even if they are trained or experienced and hence more productive than other workers entering these positions. In the steel plants men started as general helpers. In the garment factory women worked for three months as trainees, receiving no more than the minimum wage. In the nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals women generally started as assistants to nursing aides.

Over a period of time many of the Korean workers who were initially employed as unskilled labourers were able to work their way up into semi-skilled and even skilled categories. In the steel fabricating plants some men were able to become semi-skilled fitters' helpers, and a smaller number became skilled fitters. Nevertheless, a number of factors tended to block or hinder occupational advance.

In the garment factory and nursing homes there was a very limited range of occupational categories. Women could move from the position of trainee or nursing aide assistant to sower and nursing aide respectively. For higher positions more skill and training were required, as well as proficiency in English. This was also the case for men wishing to advance to the position of fitter from that of fitter's helper.

Even if Korean immigrants were able to qualify themselves for skilled positions in the sectors they found themselves concentrated in it was very difficult for them to obtain such positions. According to the accounts of the informants the basic reason for this difficulty was discrimination. Several informants stated that less skilled and less experienced Canadian workers were given promotions above them into skilled or supervisory categories. Again this practice appears to have been much more blatant in the garment factory and the nursing homes than in the steel plants. At the time of the study there were no Korean women working in the nursing homes as nurses or floor directors, even though many of them were qualified nurses. In the garment factory there were no Korean supervisory personnel, even though a number of Koreans had been working there for several years.

To summarize, most Korean immigrants in Edmonton were concentrated in a few productive or service sectors. They were subject to very limited occupational mobility within these sectors and even more restrictions if they attempted

to change to other types of work. Their concentration in these sectors was combined with their isolation from other workers due to their occupational concentration in unskilled or semi-skilled positions or in ethnic work groups, their lack of proficiency in English, and inter-ethnic differences and competition, as well as discriminatory employment practices.

This combination of concentration and isolation made them easily prone to speedups over-time and intensification in production without concomitant pay increases or promotional advances. A vivid example of the utility of immigrant workers for the production of surplus value was the case of a Korean woman who had worked at the garment factory for ten years. Because of her level of skill and experience the management put her to work as a utility sower, replacing those who were sick or absent. This position required skill and experience because the worker would have to sew a number of different kinds of pieces, rather than the normal practice of routinely sewing one type of material. Hence she received higher piece-rate for her work. After a few months she had become extremely proficient at utility sewing and was able to complete well over the assigned amount of work, so that her piece-rate earnings were quite high. At this point, the factory management lowered her basic salary, resulting in her real wages falling below what they had been as a regular sower. Caught in a bind, she had to intensify her work so that her earnings from the piece-rate could make up for her salary reduction.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION: CLASS AND COMMUNITY

The formation and development of the Korean community in Edmonton was due in part to the common cultural experience of its members. The few Korean families in Edmonton in the mid-1960's formed an informal organization because of their cultural and national isolation from the larger social structure and because of their own common language and cultural background. As the size of the immigrant population grew, its members recognized the need for a formal organization to coordinate community activities such as picnics and New Year's Eve celebrations. The formal organization could also represent the community to various levels of government and coordinate the community's involvement in inter-ethnic festivals or meetings.

Sociocultural variables such as language and kinship also tended to unite Korean immigrants into a community formation. Their difficulty with English and their comfort with their own language was a definite impetus for creating social bonds among themselves. Households often contained three generations spanning grandparents, married children, and their children. Several households were connected by kinship ties. In addition, the presence of two Korean churches served to maintain cultural tradition and social interaction within the community.

However active cultural variables may have been in the formation of the Korean community, the capitalist division of labour and class relations arising from it were the primary determinants both of the formation of the community and its fragmented character. The pre-condition for the formation of a Korean community in Edmonton — the immigrant population — existed because the uneven development of Korea resulting from its incorporation into the capitalist world economy, motivated those who could to emigrate and thus escape economic, social and political hardship or suffocation. Their pre-existing subordination to capital at the international level, the particular requirements of the capitalist division of labour and production process in Edmonton and the conduct of Canadian immigration policy in serving the interests of capital accumulation were responsible for a certain number of Korean émigrés reaching Edmonton.

The concentration of the majority of Korean immigrants in a few economic sectors and their isolation from other workers in the workplace established the conditions for their general social isolation. Their involvement in the production process was the primary source and location of their interaction with Canadians and other immigrants. Yet the social relations of production were structured in such a way as to ensure either minimal interaction with other workers or competitive and antagonistic relations between workers, not just as individuals but as members of particular ethnic groups or nationalities. Unable to estab-

lish genuine social relations with other workers in the workplace, they were even less likely to be able to establish such social relations with Canadians outside the workplace.

The concentration and isolation of Koreans in the workplace thus encouraged them to establish and maintain links with other Koreans. Nevertheless, the social division of labour was also a centrifugal force, fragmenting the community and setting various elements of it at odds with each other. This fragmentation and social conflict resided first in the presence of different social classes in the Korean community. Working class informants held ambivalent attitudes toward the established professional strata, on the one hand complaining bitterly that they jealously protected their privileged position and used their political dominance in the community to guard their social status (and vice versa) and on the other hand showing deference toward them for having successfully established themselves. Several informants from the professional strata maintained their position that new and/or working class immigrants should find their own way in the new society and should not expect the community organizations to act on their behalf.

These very different sets of attitudes were representative of distinct social classes and of the non-complementary and often contradictory relations between them, and helped to perpetuate such forms of social distance. The second source of community fragmentation and social conflict lay in the production process itself. Even though

most Koreans were concentrated as workers in a few industrial and service sectors, there were occupational distinctions between them which tended to create hostility between workers in different occupational categories. This was the case for men working in the steel fabricating plants much more than for women working in the nursing homes or garment factory. In the workplaces where women were concentrated, there was a smaller range of job categories and much less mobility between them. In the larger steel plants there were several Korean men working as general helpers or fitters helpers. Many of these informants complained that Koreans in the more skilled positions refused to teach them about their jobs or advise them about various work-related issues. Even though skilled and unskilled Korean workers were often grouped together in the same shop, relations between them were formal, their differential status establishing marked social boundaries between them. A few skilled workers stated that they preferred work situations where they did not have to interact with other (unskilled) Korean workers because they did not want Canadian workers to associate them as members of a particular immigrant group. In one of the smaller plants the Korean work-team was supervised by a Korean foreman, and relations between him and the labourers were strictly formal if not antagonistic.

The result of such class and occupational distinctions arising from the division of labour and the production process was that Koreans were bound together into a community

in a fragmented and segmented manner. The social club ostensibly united all Koreans, but it did so in a way that reinforced class differentiation within the community. Members of the professional strata generally believed that the club should do little more than co-ordinate occasional social events and make representations, when necessary, to the government. Such activities, while allowing a minimal level of interaction within the community and between it and outside agencies tended to reaffirm the power and prestige of the professional strata because they were in the best position to make such representations and to sponsor and organize social events.

A vivid example of the professional strata reinforcing its specific social position under the umbrella of the community organization occurred shortly after fieldwork had formally ended. In the late summer and early fall of 1975, the Province of Alberta established a special relationship with a "sister" province in South Korea. During negotiations, the Government of Alberta had recourse to consult with the Korean Association in Edmonton and later sponsored a Korean cultural night and provided expenses for the president and his wife to travel with the Alberta delegation to Korea. The president at the time was an architect who had lived in Edmonton since the 1960s and who had belonged to the original informal group of professionals. Although the cultural night brought together most Koreans in Edmonton and encouraged a general feeling of dignity and pride in the

community, it reinforced the prestige and power of the professional strata in particular. Because of their intital advantage in terms of time, resources, languages and social ties outside the community it was with them that the government consulted and they were primarily responsible for organizing the cultural night.

Many working class informants resented what they perceived as the professional strata's self-serving management over the general direction of community affairs, and they believed that the association should be a vehicle for improving the lot of all Korean immigrants. Nevertheless, they were unable to alter substantially, the course of the association or change the prevailing patterns of intra-community interaction. In part, of course, the inability on the part of the working class to determine the course of their community was due to their initial economic and social subordination and the greater political authority of the professional strata. The election of a skilled worker as president of the association in 1975 did not appear to signal any significant adjustment of political power within the community: several working class informants believed that he had been picked for the position by certain elements of the professional strata.

The inability of the working class majority to define the terms of the mandate and direction of the community organization was also due to their own segmentation and their ambiguous attitudes about their own position and

that of the professionals. Working class Koreans were, out of necessity, generally too involved in work and in supporting themselves and their families to be able to devote time and energy to broader social and political issues. Occupational differentiation prevented the development of a consensus on what the goals of the community association should be. Finally, the deferential attitude that most working class Koreans had toward the professionals prevented them from actually challenging the established patterns of social relations within the community. Instead, they exhibited a residual and ineffective hostility and very often belief that if they worked hard they too, or at least their children, could attain a level of economic stability and social position approaching that of the professional strata.

Although the formal community structures allowed some interaction between different social strata, social interaction occurred for the most part within rather than between classes and occupational groups. The group of professionals which had formed an informal association among themselves in the mid-1960's continued to interact primarily with each other. They still held informal monthly parties just as they had done in the early years. Few professionals had close friendships with working class immigrants. Working class Koreans in Edmonton formed small friendship circles among themselves. These friendship circles appeared to be based to some extent on occupational criteria — there was a tendency for skilled workers to associate with other skilled

workers outside the workplace and for unskilled workers to associate with each other.

Primary class and occupational positions established secondary reinforcements, such as residential patterns or language proficiency, for intra-class association and antagonistic or restrained relations between classes. Many of the women who worked in the garment plant lived with their husbands and families in a neighbourhood of walk-up apartments near the plant. The majority of the garment worker's husbands were steel workers. Hence, residential patterns,while reflecting class position — in this case the working class family's need for inexpensive housing located near the workplace — reinforced social interaction among garment workers and steel workers and reduced the possibilities for interaction between themselves and the professionals, who almost invariably lived in a suburban single-family house. Moreover, there was a certain social prestige to living in a suburban house and a stigma attached to living in a walk-up apartment in an industrial district.

Proficiency in English was also conditioned by class and occupational position. Because of the nature of their work and their social situation members of the professional strata were generally more proficient and comfortable with English than were working class immigrants. Working class Koreans definitely associated proficiency in English with occupational mobility and social status. Several informants remarked bitterly that the professionals as a whole had an

unfair advantage over other Koreans by being more fluent in English. Informants from the professional strata, on the other hand, often stated that those Koreans who didn't learn English couldn't expect to advance their social position.

Yet, as we have seen it was very difficult for immigrants who were concentrated and isolated in a few industrial and service sectors to learn English. Not only did structural conditions in the workplace such as shift work and ethnic work gangs hinder their opportunities for learning English, discrimination outside (as well as inside) the workplace placed constraints on them as well. A few women informants who were working at the garment factory at the time of the study had applied for a special English course offered by the Department of Immigration and Manpower; the Department rejected their applications on the grounds that they did not need to know English where they were working. In their attempts to learn English, Korean workers were discriminated against not only by other workers, employers and government institutions but by the professional strata as well. There was one particularly striking case of a nursing aide whose engineer husband ridiculed her every time she spoke English. This is not an isolated case; that it occurred in a family content reveals the extent to which the subtle or unsubtle evocation of differential knowledge of English was used to demarcate class position. The professional strata not only manipulated differential proficiency in English to confirm ideologically their social position

they used it as one mechanism to maintain at least a loose form of political power over the community. Most informants believed that one of the criteria for holding a major office in the community organization should be proficiency in English for the executive body occasionally negotiated with the provincial government for subsidies for the organization's social activities. Language proficiency was one of the ways by which the professional strata was generally able to over-represent itself on the board.

Patterns of social interaction within the Korean community in Edmonton were not based exclusively on class criteria. Friendship, kinship and common cultural background often blurred class distinctions and established a degree of inter-class social relations. Cultural factors were also important in relations between Koreans and non-Koreans. In the workplace and in social situations where they were in contact with Canadians and other immigrants their fellow workers, bosses and acquaintances related to them — or related to them in a discriminatory manner — in part on the basis of their cultural or national distinctiveness. In addition, the association represented the community as an ethnic or national minority.

Nevertheless, social class was the primary determinant of social relations within the Korean community and between the community and the larger urban social formation. The Korean presence in Edmonton was the combined result of the uneven development of Korea and the requirements of capital

in Edmonton. Korea's incorporation into the international division of labour as a source of cheap labour power, and the state's policies which enforced the maintenance and reproduction of the reserve army of labour guaranteed that capital would have access to Korean labour not only for its operations in Korea, but internationally as well. The uneven development of Korea created the conditions in which a substantial portion of the population either desired or was compelled to emigrate.

Capitalist enterprise in Edmonton required the reproduction of its labour force. Korean immigrants not only filled labour shortages in nursing homes, garment manufacturing and steel fabricating, but did so in ways that allowed capital to increase the rate of relative surplus value: 1) they performed jobs which would probably require higher wages if Canadian workers were to perform them; 2) their isolation and vulnerability due to their status as immigrants and their ignorance of English and of prevailing social and legal conditions in Canada made them susceptible to speedups and other forms of work intensification without being in a position to demand commensurately better wages or working conditions, and; 3) it is likely that their concentration and isolation in particular sectors weakened the position of labour as a whole in those sectors vis a vis capital by segmenting the work force and aggravating competition between workers.

It was their subordination to capital in the partic-

ular ways outlined above and in the preceeding discussion that allowed such cultural factors as ethnicity to have some degree of influence in the Korean community formation, that is, in the patterns of interaction between Koreans and between Koreans and non-Koreans. Their economic isolation and concentration set them apart as a distinct group and encouraged them to establish relationships primarily among themselves. Their isolation and particular placement in the production process also hindered the learning of English and thus reinforced their separateness from non-Koreans.

Thus, ethnicity, language and patterns of social relations in the case of the Korean community in Edmonton cannot be considered as independent of the social division of labour and class relations arising from it. Nor can the city itself be thought of as independently influencing the formation of the community. The primary condition defining the situation of most Koreans, and hence their relations with each other and with non-Koreans was their subordination to capital as sellers of labour power. Their differential location within the division of labour established the conditions for a variety of social relations within the community and between the various segments of the community and the larger urban social formation. This does not necessarily abrogate the viability of some of the conceptualizations of urban anthropology, but it does suggest that its fundamental epistemological premises — that the city is an independent cultural entity and that urban and urban-rural social relations are derived

from urban culture — are erroneous. At the present time a full analysis of urban social relations and of the role of culture in conditioning urban social relations demands situating those relations within the context of the division of labour and establishing the influence of the division of labour on the formation of social classes and the relations both between and within them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Perry. 1974, Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism. London: New Left Books.

Baldwin, Frank. 1973, Without Parallel: The American-Korean Relationship Since 1945. New York: Pantheon Books.

Barnes, J.A. 1954, Class and Communities in a Norwegian Island Parish. Human Relations 7: 39-58.

Barth, F. 1969, Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: the social organization of culture differences. F. Barth, Ed. Bergen: Universitets Fortaget.

Basham, Richard and David DeGroot. 1977, Current approaches to the Anthropology of Urban and Complex Societies. American Anthropologist 79: 414-440.

Beals, Ralf. 1951, Urbanism, Urbanization and Acculturation American Anthropogist 53: 1-10.

Berger, John and Jean Mohr. 1975, A Seventh Man., Harmondsworth: Penquin Books.

Bix, Herbert P. 1973, Regional Integration: Japan and South Korea in America's Asian Policy. In: Without Parallel: The American-Korean Relationship Since 1945. Frank Baldwin, Ed. New York: Pantheon Books. pp. 197-232.

Breidenstein, Gerhard. 1973, Capitalism in South Korea. In: Without Parallel: The American-Korean Relationship Since 1945. Frank Baldwin, Ed. New York: Pantheon Books. pp. 233-270.

Brun, Ellen and Jacques Hersh. 1976, Socialist Korea: A Case Study in the Strategy of Economic Development. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Buechler, Hans. C. and Judith-Maria Buechler. 1975, Los Suizos: Galician Migration to Switzerland. In: Migration and Development: Implications for Ethnic Identity and Political Conflict. Helen I. Safa and Brian M. DuToit, Eds. The Hauge: Mouton Publishers pp. 17-30.

Bookchin, Murray. 1974, The Limits of the City. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Carney, John G. 1976, Capital Accumulation and Uneven Development in Europe: Notes on Migrant Labour. Antipode 8 30-37.

Castles, Stephen and Godula Kosack. 1973, Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe. London: Oxford University Press.

Castells, Manuel. 1975, Immigrant Workers and Class Struggles in Advanced Capitalism, the Western European Experience. Politics and Society, 36-66.

_____. 1975, Urban Sociology and Urban Politics: From a Critique to New Trends of Research. Comparitive Urban Research 3: 7-13.

Cohen, Abner. 1974, Introduction: The Lesson of Ethnicity. In: Urban Ethnicity, Abner Cohen, Ed. London: Tavistock Publications. pp. ix-xxiv.

Cole, David. C. and Princeton, N. Lyman. 1971, Korean Development: The Interplay of Politics and Economics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dahlby, Tracy. 1976, Cheap Fuel for Tokyo's Export Drive. Far Eastern Economic Review 93 (September 17): 114.

De Vos, George and Lola Romannucci-Ross. 1975, Ethnic Identity. Palo Alta: Mayfield.

Dobb, Maurice. 1963, Studies in the Development of Capitalism. New York: International Publishers.

Eames, Edwin and Judith Granich Good. 1977, Anthropology of the City: An Introduction to Urban Anthropology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Eastman, Carol. 1975, Ethnicity and the social scientist: phonemes and distinctive features. African Studies Review 18: 29-38.

Engels, Frederick. 1972, The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Foster, George M. and Robert V. Kemper. 1974, Introduction: A Perspective on Anthropological Fieldwork in Cities. In: Anthropologists in Cities. George M. Foster and Robert V. Kemper, Eds. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. pp. 1-18.

Fox, Richard, G. 1977, Urban Anthropology: Cities in their Cultural Settings. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Friedman, John and Robert Wolff. 1976, The urban transition: comparitive studies of newly industrializing societies. In: Progress in Geography. Volume 8. Christopher Board et al. Eds. London: Edward Arnold.

Fustel De Coulanges. 1956, The Ancient City: a study on the religion, laws and institutions of Greece and Rome. Garden City: Doubleday.

Gorz, Andre. 1970, Immigrant Labour, New Left Review 61: 28-32.

Green, Alan G. 1976, Immigration and the Postwar Canadian Economy. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Harvey, David. 1973, Social Justice and the City. London: Edward Arnold.

Hasan, Parvez. 1976, Korea: Problems and Issues in a Rapidly Developing Economy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hauser, Philip M. 1965, Observations on the Urban-Folk and Urban-Rural Dichotomies as Forms of Western Ethnocentrism. In: Philip M. Hauser and Leo F. Schnore, Eds. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Holland, Stuart. 1976, Capital Versus the Regions. London: The Macmillan Press.

Hsu, F.L.K. 1965, The effect of dominant kinship relations on kin and non-kin behaviour: A hypothesis. American Anthropologists 67:

Kim, Hyung-chan. 1977, (ed.) "The Korean Diaspor", Historical and Sociological Studies of Korean Immigration and Assimilation in North America. ABC-Clio Inc. Santa Barbara, California.

Kushner, Gilbert. 1970, The Anthropology of Complex Societies. In: Biennial Review of Anthropology (1969). Bernard J. Siegal, Ed. Standford: Standford University Press.

Kuznets, Paul. 1977, Economic Growth and Structure in the Republic of Korea. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Leeds, Anthony. 1968, The Anthropology of Cities: Some Methodological Issues. In: Urban Anthroplogy: Research Perspectives and Strategies. Elizabeth M. Eddy, Ed. Athens: Southern Anthropological Society.

Lewis, O. 1952, Urbanization without breakdown: a case study. The Scientific Monthly 75: 31-41.

_____. 1961, The Children of Sanchez: Autobiography of a Mexican Family. New York: Random House.

_____. 1965, La Vida. New York: Random House.

_____. 1966, The Culture of Poverty. Scientific American 215: 1925.

Long, Don. 1977, Repression and Development in the Periphery: South Korea In: Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars 9, Vol 2.: 26-41.

Mandel, Ernest. 1975, Late Capitalism. London: New Left Books.

Marshall, Adriana. 1973, The Import of Labour: The Case of the Netherlands. Rotterdam: Rotterdam University Press.

Marx, Karl. 1959, Capital. Volume One. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

_____. 1964. Pre-capitalist Economic Formations. ed. E.J. Hobsbawm. New York International Publishers.

Marx, Karl, and Engles Frederick. 1970, The German Ideology New York International Press.

Mellor, J.R. 1977, Urban Sociology in an Urbanized Society. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Merrington, John. 1975, Town and Country in the transition to Capitalism. New Left Review 93: 71-92.

Mitchell, J. Clyde. 1966, Theoretical Orientations in African Urban Studies. In: The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies. Micheal Banton, Ed. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. pp. 37-68.

Paine, Suzanne. 1974, Exporting Workers: The Turkish Case London: Cambridge University Press.

Park, R.E., E.W. Burgess, and R.D. McKenzie. 1925, The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ramsey, Douglas. 1978, Moving from Developing to Developed Status. Far Eastern Economic Review 95 (May 26): 42-44.

Redfield, R. 1930, Tepoztlan, A Mexican Village. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1941, The Folk Cultural of Yucatan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1954, The Cultural roles of cities. Economic Development and Cultural Change 3: 53-73.

_____. 1960, Peasant Society and Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sapir, Edward. 1922, Culture, Genuine and Spurious. The Dalhousie Review 2: 165-178.

Sardie-Beirman, Sabine. 1976, Cities and City planning in Capitalist Societies. Kapitalistate 4-5: 125-140.

Simmel, G. 1950, Metropolis and Mental Life. In: The Sociology of Georg Simmel. K.H. Wolff, Ed. Chicago: Free Press.

Suh, Sang-Chul. 1978, Growth and Structural Changes in the Korean Economy, 1910-1940. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tönnies, F. 1963, Community and Society. New York: Harper and Row.

Ward, Antony. 1975, European Capitalism's reserve army. Monthly Review 27: 17-32.

Warner, W.L. 1941, Social Anthropology and the modern Community. American Journal of Sociology 46: 785-796.

Warner, W.L. and J.O. Low. 1947, The Social System of the Modern Factory. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Warner, W.L. and P.S. Lunt. 1941, The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Warner, W.L. and L. Strole. 1945, The Social System of American Ethnic Groups. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Weaver, Thomas and Douglas White. 1972, Anthropological Approaches to Urban and Complex Society. In the Anthropology of Urban Environments. Thomas Weaver and Douglas White, Eds. Boulder: The Society for Applied Anthropology. pp. 109-126.

Worsley, Peter. 1976, Proletarians, sub-proletarians, lumpen-proletarians, marginalidados, migrants, urban peasants and urban poor. Sociology 10: 133-142.

Valentine, Charles. 1968, Culture and Poverty; critique and counter-proposal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Van Den Berghe, Pierre. 1973, Pluralism. In Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. John J. Honigmann, Ed. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. pp. 959-978.

Weber, M. 1958, The City. Chicago: Free Press.

Wirth, L. 1938, Urbanism as a way of life. American Journal of Sociology 44: 1-24.